



600098710V



THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO
NEW-STREET SQUARE

THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'

Quarterly Review on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1865.

101. f. 471.

The right of translation is reserved.

Digitized by Google

CONTENTS.



PAGE

PART I. 1

PART II. 73

PART III. 161

PART IV. 273

PART V. 357

PART I.

THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'

Quarterly Review on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

PART I.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1865.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
ADVERTISEMENT TO THE PEOPLE'S EDITION	5,6
PREFACE TO PART I.	7-24
I. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS	25-28
II. THE FAMILIES OF JUDAH AND MOSES	29,30
III. THE NUMBER OF THE CONGREGATION	30-32
IV. THE CAMP AND THE PRIEST'S DUTIES	32-34
V. THE ISRAELITES NUMBERED, DWELLING IN TENTS AND ARMED	34-37
VI. THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER	37-40
VII. THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT	40,41
VIII. THE FLOCKS AND HERDS IN THE DESERT	41-48
IX. THE LAND OF CANAAN: THE NUMBER OF THE FIRST-BORNS	48-50
X. THE SOJOURNING IN EGYPT, AND THE EXODUS IN THE FOURTH GENERATION	51-54
XI. THE NUMBER OF ISRAELITES AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS	54-59
XII. THE NUMBER OF PRIESTS AT THE EXODUS	59-64
XIII. THE WAR ON MIDIAN	64-66
XIV. CONCLUDING REMARKS	67-72

SPEAK thou the Truth. Let others fence,
And trim their words for pay ;
In pleasant sunshine of pretence
Let others bask their day.

Guard thou the Fact : though clouds of night
Down on thy watch-tower stoop ;
Though thou shouldst see thine heart's delight
Borne from thee by their swoop.

Face thou the wind. Though safer seem
In shelter to abide,
We were not made to sit and dream ;
The safe must first be tried.

DEAN ALFORD.

ADVERTISEMENT

TO

THE PEOPLE'S EDITION.

IN this edition of my work on the Pentateuch, I have desired to place, in a clear and intelligible form, before the eyes of the general reader, the main arguments which have been advanced in my first four Parts, as proving the *unhistorical character*, the *later origin*, and the *compound authorship*, of the five books usually attributed to Moses.

Hitherto I have addressed myself only to the Clergy and to the more highly-educated among the Laity; and the difficulties, connected with the strict scientific treatment of the subject, have confined, of course, the study of my work to a comparatively limited, though still in itself extensive, circle. But now I address the general public. I should feel, indeed, that, unless I had first stated at length, for the consideration and examination of the learned, the grounds on which my conclusions are based, I should not be justified in bringing the discussion of these questions in this form within the reach of the People at large. But a long interval has now elapsed, since my First Part was published; and I have sufficiently tested the validity of my arguments by the character of the answers, which have been given to some of them. Being thus satisfied of the soundness of my position, and the general truth of the main results of my critical labours, I here lay my work before the many, corrected and condensed, without any loss of real substance, but stripped of the Hebrew quotations and some more difficult details, for which reference may be made to the larger volumes. And I have the less hesitation in doing this, inasmuch as the subjects here treated of have been of late, and are still, discussed freely in the public journals; so that no thoughtful person can fail to see that we have here before us one of the great questions of the time, of which *this* generation must give account to future ages.

Further, the violent denunciations which in so many instances have taken the place of argument, and the course adopted by the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, in circulating a

'People's Edition' of the late Dr. M'CAUL's 'Reply,' which has been commended by the Bishop (BICKERSTETH) of RIPON in his recent Charge as having given to my work 'a decisive and complete refutation,' have made it the more desirable that the 'People' themselves, — that is, all persons of common sense, whether learned or otherwise, — should have the opportunity of seeing with their own eyes what is the real state of the case. And especially I must desire that the inhabitants of Natal and of South Africa, generally, who have heard me condemned in very violent terms by the Metropolitan Bishop of CAPE TOWN, and who cannot be expected to have made much acquaintance with my books in their larger form, should be able to judge for themselves as to the contents, and as to the whole tone and spirit, of my work.

Lastly, when I find the Bishop of RIPON, urging his Clergy to impress upon their flocks that —

the whole Bible is the infallible record of the Mind and Will of God. . . . The Bible, like its Author, is pure unchangeable truth—truth, without admixture of error,—

when I find the Bishop (HAMPDEN) of HEREFORD asserting in like manner (*Guardian*, June 15th, 1864) that, to 'deny the infallible authority of the Bible,' that is, I presume, of every line and letter of the Bible, is to 'depart from the faith,'—and the Bishop of CAPE TOWN maintaining, in his Judgment on my (so called) 'Trial,' that 'in the belief of the Church'—

the whole Bible is the unerring Word of the Living God, p.382—

the Church regards, and expects all its officers to regard, the Holy Scriptures as teaching pure and simple truth—it is nothing to reply that they teach what is true in all things necessary to salvation, p.390—

I hold it to be my duty, as a servant of God and a lover of the souls of men, to do my utmost to counteract a system of teaching, which I believe to be erroneous and mischievous, and one of the greatest hindrances to the progress of true Religion in the land.

J. W. NATAL.

LONDON: August 18, 1864.

PREFACE TO PART I.

THE CIRCUMSTANCES, under which this book has been written, will be best indicated by the following extracts from a letter, which I addressed some time ago, (though I did not forward it,) to a Professor of Divinity in one of our English Universities, (Prof. HAROLD BROWNE, now Bishop of ELY.)

‘My remembrance of the friendly intercourse, which I have enjoyed with you in former days, would be enough to assure me that you will excuse my troubling you on the present occasion, were I not also certain that, on far higher grounds, you will gladly lend what aid you can to a brother in distress, and in very great need of advice and assistance, such as few are better able to give than yourself. You will easily understand that, in this distant colony, I am far removed from the possibility of converse with those, who would be capable of appreciating my difficulties, and helping me with friendly sympathy and counsel. I have many friends in England; but there are few, to whom I would look more readily than to yourself, for the help which I need, from regard both to your public position and private character; and you have given evidence, moreover, in your published works, of that extensive reading and sound judgment, the aid of which I specially require under my present circumstances.

‘You will, of course, expect that, since I have had the charge of this Diocese, I have been closely occupied in the study of the Zulu tongue, and in translating the Scriptures into it. Through the blessing of God, I have now translated the New Testament completely, and several parts of the Old, among the rest the books of Genesis and Exodus. In this work I have been aided by intelligent natives; and, having also published a Zulu Grammar and Dictionary, I have acquired sufficient knowledge of the language, to be able to have intimate communion with the native mind, while thus engaged with them, so as not only to avail myself freely of their criticisms, but to appreciate fully their objections and difficulties. Thus, however, it has happened that

I have been brought again face to face with questions, which caused me some uneasiness in former days, but with respect to which I was then enabled to satisfy my mind sufficiently for practical purposes, and I had fondly hoped to have laid the ghosts of them at last for ever. Engrossed with parochial and other work in England, I did what, probably, many other clergymen have done under similar circumstances,—I contented myself with silencing, by means of the specious explanations, which are given in most commentaries, the ordinary objections against the historical character of the early portions of the Old Testament, and settled down into a willing acquiescence in the general truth of the narrative, whatever difficulties might still hang about particular parts of it. In short, the doctrinal and devotional portions of the Bible were what were needed most in parochial duty. And, if a passage of the Old Testament formed at any time the subject of a sermon, it was easy to draw from it practical lessons of daily life, without examining closely into the historical truth of the narrative. It is true, there were one or two stories, which presented great difficulties, too prominent not to be noticed, and which were brought every now and then before us in the Lessons of the Church, such, for instance, as the account of the Creation and the Deluge. But, on the whole, I found so much of Divine Light and Life in these and other parts of the Sacred Book, so much wherewith to feed my own soul and the souls of others, that I was content to take all this for granted, as being true in the main, however wonderful, and as being at least capable, in an extreme case, of *some* sufficient explanation.

‘Here, however, as I have said, amidst my work in this land, I have been brought face to face with the very questions which I then put by. While translating the story of the Flood, I have had a simple-minded, but intelligent, native,—one with the docility of a child, but the reasoning powers of mature age,—look up, and ask, ‘Is all that true? Do you really believe that all this happened thus,—that all the beasts, and birds, and creeping things, upon the earth, large and small, from hot countries and cold, came thus by pairs, and entered into the ark with Noah? And did Noah gather food for them *all*, for the beasts and birds of prey, as well as the rest?’ My heart answered in the words of the Prophet, ‘Shall a man speak lies in the name of the LORD?’ Zech. xiii. 3. I dared not do so. My own knowledge of some branches of science, of Geology in particular, had been much increased since I left England; and I now knew for certain, on geological grounds, a fact, of which I had only had misgivings before, viz. that a *Universal Deluge*, such as the Bible manifestly speaks of, could not possibly have taken place in the way described in the Book of Genesis, not to mention other difficulties which the story contains.

I refer especially to the circumstance, well known to all geologists, that volcanic hills of immense extent exist in Auvergne and Languedoc, which must have been formed ages before the Noachian Deluge, and which are covered with light and loose substances, pumice-stone, &c., that must have been swept away by a Flood, but do not exhibit the slightest sign of having ever been so disturbed. Of course, I am well aware that some have attempted to show that Noah's Deluge was only a *partial* one. But such attempts have ever seemed to me to be made in the very teeth of the Scripture statements, which are as plain and explicit as words can possibly be. Nor is anything really gained by supposing the Deluge to have been partial. For, as waters must find their own level on the Earth's surface, without a special miracle, of which the Bible says nothing, a Flood, which should begin by covering the top of Ararat, (if that were conceivable,) or a much lower mountain, must necessarily become universal, and in due time sweep over the hills of Auvergne. Knowing this, I felt that I dared not, as a servant of the God of Truth, urge my brother man to believe that, which I did not myself believe, which I knew to be untrue, as a matter-of-fact, historical, narrative. I gave him, however, such a reply as satisfied him for the time, without throwing any discredit upon the general veracity of the Bible history.

'But I was thus driven,—against my will at first, I may truly say,—to search more deeply into these questions; and I have since done so, to the best of my power, with the means at my disposal in this colony. And now I tremble at the result of my enquiries,—rather, I should do so, were it not that I believe firmly in a God of Righteousness and Truth and Love, who both 'IS, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek him.' Should all else give way beneath me, I feel that His Everlasting Arms are still under me. I am sure that the solid ground is there, on which my feet can rest, in the knowledge of Him, 'in whom I live, and move, and have my being,' who is my 'faithful Creator,' my 'Almighty and most Merciful Father.' That Truth I see with my spirit's eyes, once opened to the light of it, as plainly as I see the Sun in the heavens. And that Truth, I know, more or less distinctly apprehended, has been the food of living men, the strength of brave souls that 'yearn for light,' and battle for the right and the true, the support of struggling and sorrow-stricken hearts, in all ages of the world, in all climes, under all religions.'

[The letter then proceeded to state some of the principal difficulties in the account of the Exodus, which are set forth at full length in the present work, and concluded as follows.]

'Will you oblige me by telling me if you know of any books,

which to your own mind deal with these questions satisfactorily, or, rather, will you kindly direct Messrs. — to send to me the book or books you may recommend, with others which I have ordered from them? Among the rest, I have sent for HENGSTENBERG's book on the Pentateuch, which I see commended in a remarkable article in the Quarterly on 'Essays and Reviews.' That article, however, appears to me to shrink from touching the real question at issue, and, instead of meeting the Essayists with argument, to be chiefly occupied with pitying or censuring them. Certainly, there are not a few points, on which I differ strongly from those writers. But I cannot think it to be a fair way of proceeding to point out, as the *apparent consequence* of the course they are pursuing, that it will necessarily lead to infidelity or atheism. It may be so with some; must it, therefore, be so with all? The same, of course, might have been said, and probably was said, freely, and just as truly, by the Jews of St. Paul and others, and, in later times, by members of the Romish Church of our own Reformers. Our duty, surely, is to follow the Truth, wherever it leads us, and to leave the consequences in the hands of God. Moreover, in the only instance, where the writer in the Quarterly does attempt to remove a difficulty, he explains away a miracle by a piece of thorough 'neologianism,'—I mean, where he accounts for the sun 'standing still,' at the word of Joshua, by referring to 'one of the *thousand other modes*, by which God's mighty power could have accomplished that miracle, rather than by the actual suspension of the unbroken career of the motion of the heavenly bodies in their appointed courses,' which last the Bible plainly speaks of to a common understanding, though the writer seems not to believe in it.*

* So, too, Archd. PRATT writes, *Scripture and Science not at variance*, p. 25,—'The accomplishment of this [miracle] is supposed by some [N.B.] to have been by the *arresting of the earth in its rotation*. In what other words, then, could the miracle have been expressed? Should it have been said, 'So the earth ceased to revolve, and made the sun appear to stand still in the midst of heaven?' This is not the language we should use, even in these days of scientific light. Were so great a wonder again to appear, would even an astronomer, as he looked into the heavens, exclaim, 'The earth stands still!?' Would he not be laughed at as a pedant? Whereas, to use the language of appearances, and thus to imitate the style of the Holy Scriptures themselves, would be most natural and intelligible.'

It will be observed that Archd. PRATT does not commit *himself* to maintaining the above view: he says, 'it is supposed by some' to have been accomplished thus. But he argues as if this explanation were possible, and not improbable; that is to say, he lends the weight of his high position and mathematical celebrity to the support of a view, which every natural philosopher will know to be wholly untenable. For,—not to speak of the fact, that, if the earth's motion were suddenly stopped, a man's feet would be arrested, while his *body* was moving at the rate (on the equator) of 1,000 miles an hour, (or, rather, 1,000 miles a *minute*, since not only must the earth's diurnal rotation on its axis be stopped, but its annual motion also through space), so that every human being and animal would be dashed to pieces in a moment, and a mighty deluge overwhelm the earth, unless all this were prevented by a profusion of miraculous interferences,—one point is at once fatal to the above solution. Archd. PRATT quotes only the words, 'So the sun stood still in the midst of heaven, and hasted not to go down about a whole day;' and, although this is surely one of the most prominent questions, in respect of which it is asserted that 'Scripture and

'After reading that article, I felt more hopelessly than ever how hollow is the ground upon which we have so long been standing, with reference to the subject of the Inspiration of Scripture. I see that there is a very general demand made upon the clerical authors of 'Essays and Reviews,' that they should leave the Church of England, or, at least, resign their preferments. For my own part, however much I may dissent, as I do, from some of their views, I am very far indeed from judging them for remaining, as they still do, as ministers within her pale,—knowing too well, by my own feelings, how dreadful would be the wrench, to be torn from all one has loved and revered, by going out of the Church. Perhaps, they may feel it to be their duty to the Church itself, and to that which they hold to be the Truth, to abide in their stations, unless they are formally and legally excluded from them, and to claim for *all* her members, clerical as well as lay, that freedom of thought and utterance, which is the very essence of our Protestant religion, and without which, indeed, in this age of advancing science, the Church of England would soon become a mere dark prison-house, in which the mind both of the teacher and the taught would be fettered still with the chains of past ignorance, instead of being, as we fondly believed, the very home of religious liberty, and the centre of life and light for all the land. But, whatever may be the fate of that book or its authors, it is surely impossible to put down, in these days, the spirit of honest, truth-seeking, investigation into such matters as these. To attempt to do this, would only be like the futile endeavour to sweep back the tide, which is rising at our very doors. This is assuredly no time for such trifling. Instead of trying to do this, or to throw up sandbanks, which may serve for the present moment to hide from our view the swelling waters, it is plainly our duty before God and Man to see that the foundations of our faith are sound, and deeply laid in the very Truth itself.

'For myself, if I cannot find the means of doing away with my present difficulties, I see not how I can retain my Episcopal Office, in the discharge of which I must require from others a solemn declaration, that they 'do unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which, with the evidence now before me, it is impossible wholly to believe.*

Science are at variance,' he dismisses the whole subject in a short note, and never even mentions the *moon*. But the Bible says, '*The sun stood still, and the moon stayed,*' Jo.x.13; and the arresting of the earth's motion, while it might cause the appearance of the sun 'standing still,' would not account for the moon 'staying.'

It is impossible not to feel the force of Archd. PRATT's own observation, p.30, 'The lesson we learn from this example is this: How possible it is that, even while we are contending for truth, our minds may be enslaved to error by long-cherished prepossessions!'

* This was written before the recent decision of the Court of Arches, *viz.* that the above words must be held only to imply 'a bona fide belief that the Holy Scriptures

‘I need not say to you that, whatever support and comfort I may feel in the consciousness of doing what appears to be right, it would be no light thing for me, at my time of life, to be cast adrift upon the world, and have to begin life again under heavy pressure and amidst all unfavourable circumstances,—to be separated from many of my old friends, to have my name cast out as evil even by some of them, and to have it trodden under foot, as an unclean thing, by others, who do not know me,—not to speak of the pain it would cause me to leave a work like this, which has been committed to me in this land, to which my whole heart and soul have been devoted, and for which, as it seemed, God had fitted me in some measure more than for others,—a work in which I would joyfully still, if it please God, spend and be spent.

‘But God’s Will must be done. The Law of Truth must be obeyed. I shall await your reply, before I take any course, which may commit me in so serious a matter. And I feel that I shall do right to take time for careful deliberation. Should my difficulties not be removed, I shall, if God will, come to England, and there again consult some of my friends. But then, if the step must be taken, in God’s Name I must take it; and He Himself will provide for me future work on earth, of some kind or other, if He has work for me to do.’

The above letter I wrote, but did not forward, in the early part of 1861. I had not then gone so deeply into the question as I have done since. And, as I do not wish to be misunderstood by some, whom I truly esteem and love,—to whom I owe all duty and respect, but allegiance to the Truth above all,—I may here say that, at the time when I took counsel with my Episcopal Brethren at the Capetown Conference in January, 1861, I had not even begun to enter on these enquiries, though I fully intended to do so on my return to Natal. Then, however, I had not the most distant idea of the results at which I have now arrived. I am sensible, of course, that, in stating this, I lay myself open to the objection, that the views, which I now hold, are comparatively of recent date, and, having been adopted within less than two years, may be found after a while untenable, and be as quickly abandoned. I do not myself see any probability or possibility of this, so far as the *main* question is concerned, viz. the unhistorical character of the story of the Exodus, which is exhibited in the First Part of this work. But, however this may be, I have thought it right to state the simple truth. And, though

contain everything necessary to salvation, and that to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty,—by which, of course, the above conclusion is materially affected.

these views are, comparatively speaking, new to me,—and will be new, as I believe, to most of my English readers, even to many of the Clergy, of whom, probably, few have examined the Pentateuch *closely* since they took Orders, while parts of it some of them may have never really *studied* at all,—yet I am by this time well aware that most of the points here considered have been already brought forward, though not exactly in the present form, by various continental writers, with whom the critical and scientific study of the Scriptures has made more progress than it has yet done in England.*

Some, indeed, may be ready to say of this book, as the Quarterly says of the Essayists, ‘the whole apparatus is *drawn bodily* from the German Rationalists.’ This, however, is not the case; and I will, at once, state plainly to what extent I have been indebted to German sources, in the original composition of this work. Having determined that it was my duty, without loss of time, to engage myself thoroughly in the task, of examining into the foundations of the current belief in the historical credibility of the Mosaic story, I wrote to a friend in England, and requested him to send me some of the best books for entering on such a course of study, begging him to forward to me books on both sides of the question, ‘both the bane and the antidote.’ He sent me two German works, EWALD (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 7 vols.) and KURTZ (*History of the Old Covenant*, 3 vols.), the former in German, the latter in an English translation (*Clark’s Theol. Libr.*), and a book, which maintains the traditionary view, of the Mosaic origin and historical accuracy of the Pentateuch, with great zeal and ability, as will be seen by the numerous extracts which I have made from it in the body of this work. On receiving these books, I laid, for the present, EWALD on the shelf, and devoted myself to the close study of KURTZ’s work,—with what result the contents of this volume will show. I then grappled with EWALD’s book, and studied it diligently, the parts of it, at least, which concern the O.T. history. It certainly displays an immense amount of erudition, such as may well entitle it to be called, as in the Ed. Review on ‘Essays and Reviews,’ a ‘noble work.’ But, with respect to the Pentateuch, anyone, who is well acquainted with it, will perceive that my conclusions, on many important points, differ materially from EWALD’s. Besides these, I had, at first, two books of HENGSTENBERG, on the *Psalms* and on the *Christology of*

* HENGSTENBERG is very fond of representing almost all his opponents as *followers* of DE WETTE:—‘They supply themselves very freely from his stores, and have made scarcely the least addition to them.’ *Pent.* ii. p. 3. This is, of course, intended to diminish the force of their multiplied testimony, and to reduce it to the single voice of DE WETTE. But the *same* difficulties, if they *really exist*, must, of course, occur to *all*, who bring a fair and searching criticism to bear upon the subject, however they may differ in their mode of stating them.

the *O.T.* And these comprised the whole of my stock of German Theology, when the substance of my First Part was written. Since then, however, and while rewriting it with a view to publication, DE WETTE's *Einleitung*, and BLEEK's excellent posthumous work, *Einleitung in das A.T.*, have come into my hands. I have also carefully studied the most able modern works, written in defence of the ordinary view, such as HENGSTENBERG's *Dissertations on the Genuineness of the Pentateuch*, HÄVERNICK's *Introduction to the O.T.*, &c., with what effect the contents of the present work will show. At a still later period, I have been able to compare my results with those of KUENEN, in his *Historisch-Kritisch Onderzoek*, of which Part I, on the Historical Books of the *O.T.*, has just been published at Leyden, (Sept. 1861,)—a work of rare merit, but occupied wholly with critical and historical questions, such as do not come into consideration at all in the First Part of the present work. And, since my return to England, I have had an opportunity of consulting Dr. DAVIDSON's *Introduction to the O.T.*, Vols. I and II, the most able work which has yet appeared in England on the subject of Biblical Criticism.

It will be observed that I have quoted repeatedly from KURTZ, HENGSTENBERG, &c., as well as from English works of eminence, written in support of the ordinary view. I have made these quotations on principle, in order that the reader may have before him all that, as far as I am aware, can be said by the best writers on that side of the question, and may perceive also that I have myself carefully considered the arguments of such writers, and have not hastily and lightly adopted my present views; and I have often availed myself of their language, in illustration of some point occurring in the course of the enquiry, as being not only valuable on account of the information given on good authority, but liable also to no suspicion of having been composed from my own point of view, for the purpose of maintaining my argument.

Being naturally unwilling in my present position, as a Bishop of the Church, to commit myself even to a friend on so grave a subject, if it could possibly be avoided, I determined to detain my letter when written, for a time, to see what effect further study and consideration would have upon my views. At the end of that time,—in a great measure, by my being made more fully aware of the utter helplessness of KURTZ and HENGSTENBERG, in their endeavours to meet the difficulties, which are raised by a closer study of the Pentateuch,—I became so convinced of the unhistorical* character of very considerable portions of

* I use the expression 'unhistorical' or 'not historically true' throughout, rather than 'fictitious,' since the word 'fiction' is frequently understood to imply a *conscious dishonesty* on the part of the writer, an *intention* to deceive. Yet, in writing the

the Mosaic narrative, that I decided not to forward my letter at all. I did not now need counsel or assistance to relieve my own personal doubts; I had no longer any doubts; my former misgivings had been changed to certainties. The matter was become much more serious. I saw that it concerned the whole Church,—not myself, and a few more only, whose minds might have been disturbed, by making too much of minor difficulties and contradictions, the force of which might be less felt by others. It was clear to me that difficulties, such as those which are set forth in the First Part of this book, would be felt, and realised in their full force, by most intelligent Englishmen, whether of the Clergy or Laity, who should once have had them clearly brought before their eyes, and have allowed their minds to rest upon them. I considered, therefore, that I had not a right to ask of my friend privately beforehand a reply to my objections, with respect to which, as a Divinity Professor, he might, perhaps, ere long be required to express his opinion in his public capacity.

That the phenomena in the Pentateuch, to which I have drawn attention in the first instance, and which show so decisively its unhistorical character, have not yet, as far as I am aware, been set forth, in this form, before the eyes of English readers, may, perhaps, be explained as follows:

(i) Some of these difficulties would only be likely to occur to one in the same position as myself, engaged as a Missionary in translating the Scriptures, and, therefore, compelled to discuss all the minutest details with intelligent natives, whose mode of life and habits, and even the nature of their country, so nearly correspond to those of the ancient Israelites, that the very same scenes are brought continually, as it were, before their eyes, and *vividly realised in a practical point of view*, in a way in which an English student would scarcely think of looking at them.

(ii) Such studies as these have made very little progress as yet among the Clergy and Laity of *England*; and so the English mind, with its practical common-sense, has scarcely yet been brought to bear upon them. Add to which, that the study of the Hebrew language has, till of late years, been very much neglected in England in modern times.

(iii) The difficulties which have been usually brought forward in England, as affecting the historical character of the Pentateuch, are those which concern the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge; and many, who feel these difficulties very strongly, are able to get

story of the Exodus, from the ancient legends of his people, the Scripture writer may have had no more consciousness of doing wrong or of practising historical deception, than HOMER, HERODOTUS, or LIVY. It is *we*, who do *him* wrong, and do wrong to the real excellence of the Scripture story, by maintaining that it must be historically true, and that the writer *meant* it to be received and believed as such, not only by his own countrymen, but by all mankind to the end of time.

over them, by supposing the first two to embody some kind of allegorical teaching, and the last to be a report of some dread catastrophe, handed down in the form of a legend from hoar antiquity, without questioning at all the general historical truth of the story of the Exodus, upon which such important consequences depend. Hence such minds are little impressed by discussions mooted upon these points, and, indeed, are rather irritated by having these questions brought before them at all, when, as they think, they can be fairly disposed of.

(iv) Thus it is that English books, upon the historical credibility of the Mosaic narrative, are at present very few, and still fewer those, which treat the subject with the reverence due to a question, which involves the dearest hopes, and fondest beliefs, of so many; while others again, as the essays in 'Aids to Faith' and 'Replies to Essays and Reviews,' which are written in defence of the traditionary view, while professing a desire for candid and free, though reverential, examination of the subject, yet pass by entirely the main points of difficulty, as if they were wholly unknown to the writers.

(v) It is not unlikely that the works of the (so-called) *orthodox* German writers, HÄVERNICK, KURTZ, HENGSTENBERG, KEIL, &c., which are now being translated, and published in *Clark's Theological Library*, might before long have effected indirectly a considerable change in the current theology of England, by its being seen how feebly they reply to some of the more striking objections, which occur on a close study of the Pentateuch,—and which many an English reader will often learn first from these very attempts to answer them,—and also how often they are obliged, by the force of the Truth itself, to abandon ground long held sacred in England, of which several instances will appear in the body of this book. But, even then, these portions of their works are often so overlaid with a mass of German erudition, in illustration of other questions of no consequence, about which there is no doubt or dispute, that the reader is carried on from one real difficulty to another, without being exactly satisfied on each point as he passes, but yet without feeling very forcibly the failure in each particular instance, his attention being distracted, and his patience and perseverance often rather painfully tasked, in the labour of going through the intermediate matter.

(vi) On the other hand, writers of the liberal school in Germany take so completely for granted,—either on mere *critical* grounds, or because they assume from the first the utter impossibility of miracles or supernatural revelations,—the unhistorical character and non-Mosaic origin of the greater portion, at least, if not the whole, of the Pentateuch, that they do not generally take the trouble to test the credibility of the story, by entering into such

matter-of-fact enquiries, as are here made the basis of the whole argument.

There can be no doubt, however, that a very wide-spread distrust does exist among the intelligent Laity in England, as to the soundness of the traditionary view of Scripture Inspiration. But such distrust is generally grounded on one or two objections, felt strongly, perhaps, but yet imperfectly apprehended, not on a devout and careful study of the whole question, with deliberate consideration of all that can be said on both sides of it. Hence it is rather secretly felt, than openly expressed; though it is sufficiently exhibited to the eye of a reflecting man in many outward signs of the times, and in none more painfully than in the fact, which has been lamented by more than one of the English Bench of Bishops, and which every Colonial Bishop must still more sorrowfully confess, that the great body of the more intelligent students of our Universities no longer come forward to devote themselves to the service of the Church, but are drafted off into other professions. The Church of England must fall to the ground by its own internal weakness,—by losing its hold upon the growing intelligence of all classes,—unless some remedy be very soon applied to this state of things. It is a miserable policy, which now prevails, unworthy of the Truth itself, and one which cannot long be maintained, to ‘keep things quiet.’

Meanwhile, a restraint is put upon scientific enquiry* of every

* *Note to ‘People’s Edition,’ 1864.* I commend to the reader’s attention the admirable ‘Exeter Hall Lecture’ on ‘The Power of God in His Animal Creation,’ lately delivered by Prof. OWEN before ‘The Young Men’s Christian Association,’ from which I copy the following extracts.

‘Did time permit, I could open out to you another field of the Power of God, as manifested in the law of the geographical distribution of plants and animals, and show you how the peculiar life-forms, for example, which now respectively characterise South America, Australia, and New Zealand, are closely allied to, or identical with, the forms represented by fossils that characterised those parts of the dry land, before Niagara began to cut back its channel in the platform of rock, over the face of which, when uplifted 50,000 years ago, it first began to fall. *And such knowledge is incompatible with the notion of the divergence of all existing, air-breathing, or drownable, animal species from one Asiatic centre within a period of 4,000 years.*

‘But to how many in this hall might such bodies of fact and inference be distasteful,—such enlargement of their knowledge of the Power unwelcome? May I suppose that there are any here who would arrest the course of Science if they could,—would gladly fetter its diffusion? . . . I would fain believe that there are not among the representatives of the Christian world, whom I am now honoured in addressing, any to whom the expositions of the Power, teaching the world’s vast age, the co-relation and concomitancy of death with life, the unintermittance of creative acts, may be abhorrent,—who look with suspicion, dislike, or dread, upon the evidences, reasonings, proofs, of Geology, Palæontology, Geographical Zoology,—who have ears to hear, and will not listen, who have eyes to see, and will not behold. But, if such there be, let me remind them that their mental condition is the same as that of the devout Christians, when the discoveries of the shape, the motions, and cosmical relations, of our small planet were first propounded. They know not, or they refuse to receive, the later evidences of the Power of God: ‘They think they know the Scriptures, and they do err.’

‘Not but that, for all that is essential to the right life here and in the life to come, Scripture alone sufficeth: the eternal truths are plainly told. . . . It is the human element, mingling with the divine, or meddling with it, which the discoveries of science expose: it is the fence, set up about some narrowed and exclusive view, which they break down. Beware, therefore, of logically precise and definite theologies,

kind, by the fear of transgressing in some way the bounds, which the Scripture statements are supposed to have set to such speculations, and by the necessity of propitiating to some extent the popular religious feeling on the subject. Men of science, generally, have not the leisure to pursue very far for themselves such investigations as these. And, if men of devout minds, they will feel obliged to acquiesce, more or less, in the *dicta* of the Church and the Clergy, while conscious oftentimes that such *dicta* are painfully at variance with truths, which they have begun to glimpse at as the results of their own researches. They may proceed, and, probably, very many do proceed, far enough to see that there is something hollow in the popular belief, and that the modern view of Scripture Inspiration cannot possibly be true in all points. But the work of examining into its truth or falsehood is a work for theologians, not for natural philosophers, and, to be done thoroughly, it requires great labour and a special training. Hence they will probably drop the subject altogether, some sinking into practical, if even unavowed, unbelief of the whole Mosaic story, as told in the Pentateuch, others smothering up their misgivings with a general assumption that the account must be substantially true; while there are very many, who appreciate to some extent the difficulties of the traditionary view, but yet are unable to satisfy themselves that it is wholly untenable, and live in a state of painful uncertainty, which they would gladly have terminated, though even by the sharp pang of one decisive stroke, which shall sever their connection with it once and for ever.

I believe that there are not a few among the more highly educated classes of society in England, and multitudes among the more intelligent operatives, who are in danger of drifting into irreligion and practical atheism, under this dim sense of the unsoundness of the popular view, combined with a feeling of distrust of their spiritual teachers, as if *these* must be either ignorant of facts, which to themselves are patent, or, at least, insensitive to the difficulties which those facts involve, or else, being aware of their existence, and feeling their importance, are con-

accounting, from their point of view, for all things and cases, natural and preternatural, claiming to be final and all-sufficient. 'Systems of Doctrine,' 'Schemes of Christianity,' 'Dogmatic Formularies,' are of human fabrication, the works of man's brain, of which he is as proud and jealous as of the works of his hands. *They*, forsooth, must not be meddled with! Any ray of light, exposing a hole or a bad joint in them, must be shut out—the light-bringer, perhaps, anathematised! *They* must be the exception to the common lot awaiting all mortal constructions! . . . Emancipate yourselves from notions of textual meanings, which may have been early impressed upon your plastic understanding. Clear away the film or medium, which has been systematically screwed upon your mind's eye by your early teacher, with best intentions, and in best faith, whether Anglican or Athanasian, Lutheran, Wesleyan, Presbyterian, &c. As much as may be, become again 'as little children,' in seeking guidance from Holy Writ. Above all, square your actions by Christian ethics, and be assured that, as you do so, the *essential truths* will become plainer to your intellect: for 'He, that doeth of the will, shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God.' p.30-35.

sciously ignoring them. It has been said by some, 'Why make this disturbance? Why publish to the world matters like these, about which theologians may have doubts?' I answer, that they are not theologians only, who are troubled with such doubts, and that we have a duty to discharge towards that large body of our brethren,—*how* large it is impossible to say, but, probably, much larger than is commonly imagined,—who not only doubt, but disbelieve, many important parts of the Mosaic narrative, as well as to those, whose faith may be more simple and unenquiring, though not, therefore, necessarily, more deep and sincere, than theirs. We cannot expect such as these to look to us for comfort and help in their religious perplexities, if they cannot place entire confidence in our honesty of purpose and good faith,—if they have any reason to suppose that we are willing to keep back any part of the truth, and are afraid to state the plain facts of the case, as we know them.

On this subject I commend to the reader's attention the following admirable remarks of Archbishop WHATELY, (*Bacon's Essays*, with Annotations, p.11):—

We are bound never to countenance any erroneous opinion, however seemingly beneficial in its results, never to connive at any salutary delusion (as it may appear), but to open the eyes (when opportunity offers, and in proportion as it offers) of those we are instructing, to any mistake they may labour under, though it may be one which leads them ultimately to a true result, and to one of which they might otherwise fall. The temptation to depart from this principle is sometimes excessively strong, because it will often be the case that men will be in some danger, in parting with a long-admitted error, of abandoning, at the same time, some truth they have been accustomed to connect with it. Accordingly, censures have been passed on the endeavours to enlighten the adherents of some erroneous churches, on the ground that many of them thence become atheists, and many, the wildest of fanatics. That this should have been in some instances the case, is highly probable; it is a natural result of the pernicious effects on the mind of any system of blind unenquiring acquiescence. Such a system is an evil spirit, which, we must expect, will cruelly rend and mangle the patient as it comes out of him, and will leave him half dead at its departure. There will often be, and oftener appear to be, danger in removing a mistake,—the danger that those, who have been long used to act rightly on erroneous principles, may fall of the desired conclusions when undeceived. In such cases, it requires a thorough love of truth, and a firm reliance on Divine support, to adhere steadily to the straight course. If we give way to a dread of danger from the inculcation of any truth, physical, moral, or religious, we manifest a want of faith in God's power, or in the will to maintain His own cause. There may be danger attendant on every truth, since there is none that may not be perverted by some, or that may not give offence to others; but, in the case of anything which plainly appears to be truth, every danger must be braved. We must maintain the truth as we have received it, and trust to Him, who is 'the Truth,' to prosper and defend it.

That we shall indeed best further His cause by fearless perseverance in an open and straight course, I am firmly persuaded. But it is not only when we perceive the mischiefs of falsehood and disguise, and the beneficial tendency of fairness and candour, that we are to be followers of truth. The trial of our faith is when we cannot perceive this; and the part of a lover of truth is, to follow her at all seeming hazards, after the example of Him, who 'came into the world, that He should bear witness to the Truth.'

For such persons especially, as I have indicated above, I have written this book, and for all, who would really see and know how the case actually stands in this matter. I have desired to set before the reader at full length the arguments, by which I have been myself convinced upon the subject, and to take him with me, as it were, along the path, which I have followed in the search after the

Truth. It is not sufficient merely to make general statements, or to refer to this or that writer, as having irrefragably proved the truth of certain results. I have wished to enable the reader to satisfy his own mind on each point as it arises, precisely as I have satisfied mine, by a thorough discussion of all that can be said on both sides of the question.

I have here confined my enquiries chiefly to the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, though, in so doing, I have found myself compelled to take more or less into consideration the other books of the Old Testament also. Should God in his Providence call me to the work, I shall not shrink from the duty of examining on behalf of others into the question, in what way the doctrines, usually drawn from the New Testament, are affected by the un-historical character of the Pentateuch. Of course, for the satisfaction of my own mind, and in the discharge of my duties to those more immediately dependent on me, I cannot avoid doing so, if health and strength are granted me, as soon as I have completed the present work, and ascertained that the ground is sure, on which I here take my stand. For the present, I have desired to follow the leading of the truth itself, and not to distract my attention, or incur the temptation of falsifying the conclusions, to which the argument would honestly lead me, by taking account *à priori* of the consequences; and I would gladly leave to other hands the work of conducting the above enquiry at greater length for the general reader.

On one point, however, it may be well to make here a few observations. There may be some, who will say that such words as those in John vi.46,47, 'For had ye believed Moses, ye would have believed Me, for *he wrote* of Me. But, if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?'—or in Luke xx.37, 'Now that the dead are raised, even *Moses showed* at the bush, [*i.e.* in the passage about the 'bush,'] when he called the LORD, the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob,'—or in Luke xvi.29, '*They have Moses* and the Prophets; let them hear them,' and v. 31, '*If they hear not Moses* and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead,'—are at once decisive upon the point of Moses' authorship of the Pentateuch, since they imply that our Lord Himself believed in it, and, consequently, to assert that Moses did *not* write these books, would be to contradict the words of Christ, and to impugn His veracity.

To make use of such an argument is, indeed, to bring the Sacred Ark itself into the battle-field, and to make belief in Christianity itself depend entirely upon the question whether Moses wrote the Pentateuch, or not. There is, however, no force

in this particular objection, as will appear from the following considerations.

(i) First, such words as the above, if understood in their most literal sense, can only be supposed, at all events, to apply to *certain parts* of the Pentateuch; since most devout Christians will admit that the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which records the death of Moses, could not have been written by his hand, and the most orthodox commentators are obliged also to concede the probability of *some* other interpolations having been made in the original story.* It would become, therefore, even thus, a question for a reverent criticism to determine what passages give signs of *not* having been written by Moses.

(ii) But, secondly, and more generally, it may be said that, in making use of such expressions, our Lord did but accommodate His words to the current popular language of the day, as when

* *Note to People's Edition, 1864.*—Thus in a book recently published, and dedicated by permission to the Archbishop of York, we find the following statements:—

'We entered the discussion unbiassed by any theory, but prepared to adopt whatever conclusions the facts of the case, fairly considered, might seem to require. . . . And it must be confessed that the results we have thus arrived at do differ very materially from the views commonly held. The pre-Mosaic origin of large portions of Genesis, the existence of two records of the Exodus, one certainly, therefore, non-Mosaic,—the incorporation of narratives of foreign origin,—the numerous additions and occasional alterations made by a later writer after the Conquest,—these are facts very strongly at variance with the notions generally entertained. Facts they are, however—not mere theoretic fancies or unfounded assumptions; and in accordance with them must we frame our final view of the true origin of the Pentateuch.'

'Much of it is certainly un-Mosaic, some earlier, some contemporary, some later than Moses. Many portions of the Pentateuch COULD NOT have proceeded from his pen, or even have been written under his direction.'

'The materials, of which the first four books are composed, appear thus to be of very various dates and characters, the larger portion, however, being almost certainly Mosaic. They may be arranged as follows:—

'(i) A series of 'Annals,' embracing the chief features of primeval and patriarchal history down to the death of Joseph—date and authorship unknown, but some probably written in Egypt, and all certainly pre-Mosaic;

'(ii) Additional matter referring to the same periods, from the pen of Moses, variously inserted among these, to enlarge, supplement, or replace, different portions of them;

'(iii) An Elohist narrative of the sojourn in Egypt and the Exodus—date and authorship unknown;

'(iv) A Jehovistic narrative of the Exodus and passage through the wilderness, up to the erection of the Tabernacle, including the earlier portion of the Sinaitic laws,—also a list of the journeyings in the wilderness,—written by Moses;

'(v) A series of laws delivered during the last thirty-nine years of the journey through the wilderness, recorded probably by Moses;

'(vi) A narrative of the events of the second and fortieth years, with which these laws have been incorporated, written shortly after the conquest of Canaan;

'(vii) Three isolated narratives, concerning Abraham's war with the four Kings, Jethro's visit to Moses, and Balaam's prophecies—probably (in part at least) of foreign origin;

'(viii) A variety of explanatory notes, additions, and occasional alterations, with a few passages of greater length, chiefly from other ancient narratives, introduced by a writer of much later date—very probably in the days of Saul.'

'Out of these diverse materials we believe the first four books of the Pentateuch to have been compiled. The proportion in which they are to be found may be roughly expressed as follows:—

'If these four books were divided into 1,000 equal parts, then (i), the pre-Mosaic annals would make up 164 of them; (ii), (iv), and (v), the Mosaic portions, 576; (vi), the later narrative, 214; (vii), the foreign records, 26; (iii) and (viii), the Elohist Exodus, and the last revision, 10 each.'—*The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch considered*, pp. 141–151.

I do not agree with many of the critical conclusions above stated. But the reader will observe what very important admissions are here made, in a book published under such auspices, though His Grace has since said that he 'does not concur' in them.

He speaks of God 'making His sun to rise,' Matt.v.45, or of the 'stars falling from heaven,' Matt.xxiv.29, or of Lazarus being 'carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom,' Luke xvi.22, or of the woman 'with a spirit of infirmity,' whom 'Satan had bound eighteen years,' Luke xiii.16, &c., without our being at all authorised in drawing from them scientific or psychological conclusions.

(iii) Lastly, it is perfectly consistent with the most entire and sincere belief in our Lord's Divinity, to hold, as many do, that, when He vouchsafed to become a 'Son of Man,' He took our nature fully, and voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge *gradual* and *limited*. We are expressly told, in Luke ii.52, that 'Jesus increased in *wisdom*,' as well as in 'stature.' It is not supposed that, in His human nature, He was acquainted, more than any educated Jew of the age, with the mysteries of all modern sciences; nor, with the above statement of St. Luke before us, can it be seriously maintained that, as an *infant* or *young child*, He possessed a knowledge, surpassing that of the most pious and learned adults of His nation, upon the subject of the authorship and age of the different portions of the Pentateuch. At what period, then, of His life upon earth, is it to be supposed that He had granted to Him, as the Son of Man, *supernaturally*, full and accurate information on these points, so that He should be expected to speak about the Pentateuch in other terms, than any other devout Jew of that day would have employed? Why should it be thought that He would speak with certain *Divine* knowledge on this matter, more than upon other matters of ordinary science or history?

Finally, I am not aware of any breach of the Law of the Church of England, as declared by the recent judgment in the Court of Arches, which is involved in this publication. It is now ruled that the words in the Ordination Service for Deacons, 'I do unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures,' must be understood to mean simply the expression of a *bonâ fide* belief, that 'the Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation,' and 'to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty.'

I am not conscious of having said anything here, which contravenes this decision. Should it be otherwise, and should the strange phenomenon be witnessed, of a Bishop of the Protestant Church of England,—more especially one, who has been expressly occupied in translating the Scriptures into a foreign tongue,—being precluded by the Law of that Church from entering upon a close, critical, examination of them, and from bringing before the great body of the Church, (not the Clergy only, but the Clergy and

Laity,) the plain, honest, results of such criticism, I must, of course, bear the consequences of my act.

But, meanwhile, I cannot but believe that our Church, representing, as it is supposed to do, the religious feeling of a free, Protestant, nation, requires us now, as in the days of the Reformation, to protest against all perversion of the Truth, and all suppression of it, for the sake of Peace, or by mere Authority. As a Bishop of that Church, I dissent entirely from the principle laid down by some, that such a question, as that which is here discussed, is not even an open question for an English clergyman,—that we are bound by solemn obligations to maintain certain views, on the points here involved, to our lives' end, or, at least, to *resign* our sacred office in the Church, as soon as ever we feel it impossible any longer to hold them.

On the contrary, I hold that the foundations of our National Church are laid upon the Truth itself, and not upon mere human prescriptions, and that the spirit of our Church, as declared in the days of the Reformation, fully recognises my right to use all the weight of that office, with which the Providence of God has invested me, in declaring the Truth, and recommending the subject of this work to the thoughtful consideration of English Churchmen. Nine years ago, I was deemed not unworthy to be called to this high office. I trust that the labours of those years may be accepted as an evidence that, to the best of my power, I have striven to discharge faithfully the duties entrusted to me, and may serve also as a guarantee, that, in putting forward this book, I am acting in no light spirit, but with the serious earnestness of one, who believes that he owes it as a duty to the Church itself, of which he is a minister, to do his part to secure for the Bible its due honour and authority, and save its devout readers from ascribing to it attributes of perfection and infallibility, which belong to God only, and which the Bible never claims for itself. More than all others, I believe, is a Bishop bound to do this, if his conscience impels him to it,—inasmuch as he, above others, is bound to be an example to the Flock of that walking in the Light, without which there cannot be true Life in a Church, any more than in an individual soul,—‘renouncing the hidden things of dishonesty, not walking in craftiness nor handling the word of God deceitfully, but, by manifestation of the Truth, commending himself to every man’s conscience in the sight of God.’

If the arguments, on which the conclusions of these first chapters rest, shall be found, upon a thorough examination, to be substantially well-grounded and true, I trust that we shall not rest until the system of our Church be reformed, and her boundaries at the same time enlarged, to make her what a National Church should be, the Mother of spiritual life to all within the realm, embracing, as far as possible, all the piety, and learning,

and earnestness, and goodness, of the nation. Then, at last, would a stop be put to that internecine war between the servants of one God and the professed followers of the same religion, which now is a reproach to our Christian name, and seriously impedes the progress of truth and charity, both at home and abroad. Should the reception of this book, by the more thoughtful portion of the community, indicate that such a Reform is possible and probable, and will be but a question of time, so that, being able meanwhile to speak out plainly the truth, we shall have only to bear with the inconveniences and inconsistencies, which must attend a state of transition, it would not be necessary for me, or for those who think with me, to leave the Church of England voluntarily, and abandon the work to which we have devoted ourselves for life.

In conclusion, I commend this subject more especially to the attention of the Laity. *They* are happy enough to be able to lay aside such questions as these, if they will, while still continuing members of the National Church. I implore them to consider the position, in which the *Clergy* will be placed, if the facts, brought forward in this book, are found to be substantially true. Let them examine their own hearts solemnly, in the sight of God, on these points. Would they have the Clergy bound by Subscriptions and Declarations, to which they would not on any account commit themselves? Are they willing that their own sons, who may feel the Divine call to devote themselves to the ministry of souls, should be entangled in these trammels, so galling to the conscience, so injurious to their sense of truth and honesty, so impeding to the freedom and heartiness of their ministrations? *We*, indeed, who are already under the yoke, may have for a time to bear it, however painful it may be, while we struggle and hope on for deliverance. But what youth of noble mind, with a deep yearning for truth, and an ardent desire to tell out the love of God to man, will consent to put himself voluntarily into such fetters? It may be possible to represent some of the arguments in this book as invalid, others as unimportant. But, if the main result of it be true, as I believe it will be found to be, it seems to me impossible that, five years hence, unless liberty of speech on these matters be frankly acknowledged to belong to the Clergy as well as to the Laity, any of the more hopeful and intelligent of our young men will be able, with clear consciences, to enter the ministry of the Church of England.

I now commit this First Part of my work into the Hands of Almighty God, beseeching Him mercifully to accept and bless it, as a feeble effort to advance the knowledge of His Truth in the world.

J. W. NATAL.

LONDON: Oct. 4, 1862.

PART I.

THE PENTATEUCH EXAMINED AS AN HISTORICAL NARRATIVE.

CHAPTER I.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.

1. THE first five books of the Bible,—commonly called the Pentateuch, or Book of Five Volumes,—are supposed by most English readers of the Bible to have been written by Moses, except the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which records the death of Moses, and which, of course, it is generally allowed, must have been added by another hand, perhaps that of Joshua. It is believed that Moses wrote under such special guidance and teaching of the Holy Spirit, that he was preserved from making any error in recording those matters, which came within his own cognisance, and was instructed also supernaturally in respect of events, which took place before he was born,—before, indeed, there was a human being on the earth to take note of what was passing. He was in this way, it is supposed, enabled to write a true account of the Creation. And, though the accounts of the Fall and of the Flood, as well as of later events, which happened in the time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, may have been handed down by tradition from one generation to another and even, some of them, perhaps, written down in words, or represented in hieroglyphics, and Moses may, probably, have derived assistance from these sources also in the composition of his narrative, yet in all his statements, it is believed, he was under such constant control and superintendence

of the Spirit of God, that he was kept from making any serious error, and certainly from writing anything altogether untrue. We may rely with undoubting confidence—such is the statement usually made—on the historical veracity, and infallible accuracy, of the Mosaic narrative in all its main particulars.

2. There was a time, in my own life, before my attention had been drawn to the facts, which make such a view impossible for most reflecting and enquiring minds, when I thought thus, and could have heartily assented to such language as the following, which BRIGON, *Inspiration*, &c. p. 89, asserts to be the creed of orthodox believers, and which, probably, expresses the belief of many English Christians at the present day:—

The BIBLE is none other than the *Voice of Him that sitteth upon the Throne!* Every book of it—every chapter of it—every verse of it—every word of it—every syllable of it—(where are we to stop?) every letter of it—is the direct utterance of the Most High! The Bible is none other than the Word of God—not some part of it more, some part of it less, but all alike, the utterance of Him who sitteth upon the Throne—absolute—faultless—unerring—supreme.

3. Such was the creed of the School in which I was educated. God is my witness! what hours of wretchedness have I spent at times, while reading the Bible devoutly from day to day, and reverencing every word of it as the Word of God, when petty contradictions met me, which seemed to my reason to conflict with the notion of the absolute histori-

cal veracity of every part of Scripture, and which, as I felt, *in the study of any other book*, we should honestly treat as errors or misstatements, without in the least detracting from the real value of the book! But, in those days, I was taught that it was my duty to fling the suggestion from me at once, 'as if it were a loaded shell, shot into the fortress of the soul,' or to stamp out desperately, as with an iron heel, each spark of honest doubt, which God's own gift, the love of Truth, had kindled in my bosom. And by many a painful effort I succeeded in doing so for a season.

4. But my labours, as a translator of the Bible, and a teacher of intelligent converts from heathenism, have brought me face to face with questions, from which I had hitherto shrunk, but from which, under the circumstances, I felt it would be a sinful abandonment of duty any longer to turn away. I have, therefore, as in the sight of God Most High, set myself deliberately to find the answer to such questions, with, I trust and believe, a sincere desire to know the Truth, as God wills us to know it, and with a humble dependence on that Divine Teacher, who alone can guide us into that knowledge, and help us to use the light of our minds aright. The result of my enquiry is this, that I have arrived at the conviction,—as painful to myself at first as it may be to my reader, though painful now no longer under the clear shining of the Light of Truth,—that the Pentateuch, as a whole, cannot possibly have been written by Moses, or by any one acquainted personally with the facts which it professes to describe, and, further, that the (so-called) Mosaic narrative, by whomsoever written, and though imparting to us, as I fully believe it does, revelations of the Divine Will and Character, cannot be regarded as *historically true*.

5. Let it be observed that I am not here speaking of a number of petty variations and contradictions, such as, on closer examination, are found to exist throughout the books, but which may be in many cases sufficiently explained, by alleging our ignorance of

all the circumstances of the case, or by supposing some misplacement, or loss, or corruption, of the original manuscript, or by suggesting that a later writer has inserted his own gloss here and there, or even whole passages, which may contain facts or expressions at variance with the true Mosaic Books, and throwing an unmerited suspicion upon them. However perplexing such contradictions are, when found in a book which is believed to be divinely infallible, yet a humble and pious faith will gladly welcome the aid of a friendly criticism, to relieve it in this way of its doubts. I can truly say that I would do so heartily myself.

6. Nor are the difficulties, to which I am now referring, of the same kind as those, which arise from considering the accounts of the Creation and the Deluge, (though these of themselves are very formidable,)—or the stupendous character of certain miracles, as that of the sun and moon standing still, or the waters of the river Jordan standing in heaps as solid walls, while the stream, we must suppose, was still running, or the ass speaking with human voice, or the miracles wrought by the magicians of Egypt, such as the conversion of a rod into a snake, and the latter being endowed with life.

7. They are not such, again, as arise, when we regard the trivial nature of a vast number of conversations and commands, ascribed directly to Jehovah, especially the multiplied ceremonial minutiae, laid down in the Levitical Law. They are not such, even, as must be started at once in most pious minds, when such words as these are read, professedly coming from the Holy and Blessed One, the Father and 'Faithful Creator' of all mankind:—

'If the master (of a Hebrew servant) have given him a wife, and she have borne him sons or daughters, *the wife and her children shall be her master's*, and he shall go out free by himself,' E.xxi.4:

the wife and children in such a case being placed under the protection of such other words as these,—

'If a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand, he shall be surely punished. *Notwithstanding*, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for *he is his money*.' E.xxi.20,21.

8. I shall never forget the revulsion of feeling, with which a very intelligent Christian native, with whose help I was translating these last words into the Zulu tongue, first heard them as words said to be uttered by the same great and gracious Being, whom I was teaching him to trust in and adore. His whole soul revolted against the notion, that the Great and Blessed God, the Merciful Father of all mankind, would speak of a servant or maid as mere 'money,' and allow a horrible crime to go unpunished, because the victim of the brutal usage had survived a few hours!

9. But I wish, before proceeding, to repeat here most distinctly that my reason, for no longer receiving the Pentateuch as historically true, is not that I find insuperable difficulties with regard to the *miracles*, or supernatural *revelations* of Almighty God, recorded in it, but solely that I cannot, as a true man, consent any longer to shut my eyes to the absolute, palpable, self-contradictions of the narrative. We need only consider well the statements made in the books themselves, by whomsoever written, about matters which they profess to narrate as facts of common history,—statements, which every Clergyman, at all events, and every Sunday-School Teacher, not to say, every Christian, is surely bound to examine thoroughly, and try to understand rightly, comparing one passage with another, until he comprehends their actual meaning, and is able to explain that meaning to others. If we do this, we shall find them to contain a series of manifest contradictions and inconsistencies, which leave us, it would seem, no alternative but to conclude that main portions of the story of the Exodus, though based, probably, on some real historical foundation, yet are certainly not to be regarded as historically true.

10. The proofs, which seem to me to be conclusive on this point, I feel it to be my duty, in the service of God and the Truth, to lay before my fellow-men, not without a solemn sense of the responsibility which I am thus incurring, and not without a painful foreboding of the serious consequences which, in many

cases, may ensue from such a publication. There will be some now, as in the time of the first preaching of Christianity, or in the days of the Reformation, who will seek to turn their liberty into a 'cloak of lasciviousness.' 'The unrighteous will be unrighteous still; the filthy will be filthy still.' The heart, that is unclean and impure, will not fail to find excuse for indulging its lusts, from the notion that somehow the very principle of a living faith in God is shaken, because belief in the Pentateuch is shaken. But it is not so. Our belief in the Living God would remain as sure as ever though not the Pentateuch only, but the whole Bible, were removed. It is written on our hearts by God's own Finger, as surely as by the hand of the Apostle in the Bible, that 'GOD IS, and is a rewarder of them that diligently seek Him.' It is written there also, as plainly as in the Bible, that 'God is not mocked,'—that, 'whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap,'—and that 'he that soweth to the flesh, shall of the flesh reap corruption.'

11. But there will be others of a different stamp,—meek, lowly, loving souls, who are walking daily with God, and have been taught to consider a belief in the historical veracity of the story of the Exodus an essential part of their religion, upon which, indeed, as it seems to them, the whole fabric of their faith and hope in God is based. It is not really so: the Light of God's Love did not shine less truly on pious minds, when Enoch 'walked with God' of old, though there was then no Bible in existence, than it does now. And it is, perhaps, God's Will that we shall be taught in this our day, among other precious lessons, not to build up our faith upon a Book, though it be the Bible itself, but to realise more truly the blessedness of knowing that He Himself, the Living God, our Father and Friend, is nearer and closer to us than any book can be,—that His Voice within the heart may be heard continually by the obedient child that listens for it, and *that* shall be our Teacher and Guide, in the path of duty, which is the path of life, when all other

helpers—even the words of the Best of Books—may fail us.

12. In discharging, however, my present duty to God and to the Church, I trust that I shall be preserved from saying a single word that may cause *unnecessary* pain to those, who now embrace with all their hearts, as a primary article of Faith, the traditional view of Scripture Inspiration. *Pain*, I know, I must cause to some. But I feel very deeply that it behoves every one, who would write on such a subject as this, to remember how closely the belief in the historical truth of every portion of the Bible is interwoven, at the present time, in England, with the faith of many, whose piety and charity may far surpass his own. He must beware lest, even by rudeness or carelessness of speech, he 'offend one of these little ones'; while yet he may feel it to be his duty, as I do now, to tell out plainly the truth, as God, he believes, has enabled him to see it. And that truth in the present instance, I repeat, is this, that the Pentateuch, as a whole, was not written by Moses, and that, with respect to some, at least, of the chief portions of the story, it cannot be regarded as historically true.

13. But the Bible does not, therefore, cease to 'contain the true Word of God,' to enjoin 'things necessary for salvation,' to be 'profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness.' It still remains for us that Book, which, whatever intermixture it may show of human elements,—of error, infirmity, passion, and ignorance,—has yet, through God's Providence, and the special working of His Spirit on the minds of its writers, been the means of revealing to us His True Name, the Name of the only Living and True God, and has all along been, and, as far as we know, will never cease to be, the mightiest instrument in the hand of the Divine Teacher, for awakening in our minds just conceptions of His Character, and of His gracious and merciful dealings with the children of men. Only we must not attempt to put into the Bible what we think *ought* to be there: we must not lay it down as certain beforehand that God could only

reveal Himself to us by means of an *infallible* Book. We must be content to take the Bible as it is, and draw from it those Lessons which it really contains.

14. Accordingly, that which I shall do, or endeavour to do, in this work, is to make out from the Bible—at least, from the first part of it—what account it gives of itself, what it really is, what, if we love the truth, we must understand and believe it to be, what, if we will speak the truth, we must represent it to be. I believe assuredly that the time is come, in the ordering of God's Providence and in the history of the world, when such a task as this *must* be taken in hand, not in a light and scoffing spirit, but in that of a devout and living faith, which seeks only Truth, and follows fearlessly its footsteps,—when such questions as these must be asked,—be asked reverently, as by those who feel that they are treading on hallowed ground,—but be asked firmly, as by those who would be able to give an account of the hope which is in them, and to know that the grounds are sure, on which they rest their trust for time and for Eternity.

15. The spirit, indeed, in which such a work should be carried on, cannot be better described than in the words of Mr. BURGON, who says, *Inspiration, &c. p. cxli*:—

Approach the volume of Holy Scripture with the same candour, and in the same unprejudiced spirit, with which you would approach any other famous book of high antiquity. Study it with, at least, the same attention. Give, at least, equal heed to *all* its statements. Acquaint yourself at least as industriously with its method and principle, employing and applying either with at least equal fidelity in its interpretation. *Above all, beware of playing tricks with its plain language.* Beware of suppressing any part of the evidence which it supplies to its own meaning. Be truthful, and unprejudiced, and honest, and consistent, and logical, and exact throughout, in your work of interpretation.

And again he writes, commending a closer attention to Biblical studies to the younger members of the University, *p. 12*,

I contemplate the continued exercise of a most curious and prying, as well as a most vigilant and observing, eye. No difficulty is to be neglected; no peculiarity of expression is to be disregarded; no minute detail is to be overlooked. The hint, let fall in an earlier chapter, is to be compared with a hint let fall in the later place. *Do they tally or not? And what follows?*

CHAPTER II.

THE FAMILIES OF JUDAH AND MOSES.

16. I SHALL first show, by means of a few prominent instances, that the books of the Pentateuch, in their own account of the story which they profess to relate, contain such remarkable contradictions, and involve such plain impossibilities, that they cannot be regarded as true narratives of actual, historical, matters of fact.

17. THE FAMILY OF JUDAH.

'And the sons of Judah, Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah; but Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan; and the sons of Pharez were Hezron and Hamul.' G.xlvi.12.

It appears to be certain that the writer here means to say that Hezron and Hamul were *born in the land of Canaan*, and were among the seventy persons, (including Jacob himself, and Joseph, and his two sons,) who *came into Egypt* with Jacob.

'These are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt,' v.8.

'All the souls, that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins, besides Jacob's son's wives, were threescore and six,' v.26,—which they would not be without Hezron and Hamul.

'And the sons of Joseph, which were born him in Egypt, were two souls: all the souls of the house of Jacob, which came into Egypt, were threescore and ten.' v.27.

'These are the names of the children of Israel, which came into Egypt; every man and his household came with Jacob. And all the souls, that came out of the loins of Jacob, were seventy souls; for Joseph was in Egypt already.' E.i.1,5.

'Thy fathers went down into Egypt with threescore and ten persons; and now the Lord thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude.' D.x.22.

I assume, then, that the narrative of the Exodus distinctly involves the statement, that the sixty-six persons, 'out of the loins of Jacob,' who are mentioned in G.xlvi, and no others, went down with him into Egypt.

18. Now Judah was forty-two * years

* Joseph was thirty years old, when he 'stood before Pharaoh,' as governor of the land of Egypt, G.xli.46; and from that time nine years elapsed, (seven of plenty and two of famine,) before Jacob came down to Egypt. At that time, therefore, Joseph was thirty-nine years old. But Judah was about three years older than Joseph; for Judah was born in the fourth year of Jacob's double marriage, G.xxix.35, and Joseph in the seventh, G.xxx.24-26, xxxi.41. Hence Judah was forty-two years old when Jacob went down to Egypt.

old, according to the story, when he went down with Jacob into Egypt.

But, if we turn to G.xxxviii, we shall find that, in the course of these forty-two years of Judah's life, the following events are recorded to have happened.

(i) Judah grows up, marries a wife, and has, separately, three sons by her.

(ii) The eldest of these three sons grows up, is married, and dies.

The second grows to maturity, (suppose in another year,) marries his brother's widow, and dies.

The third grows to maturity, (suppose in another year still,) but declines to take his brother's widow to wife.

She then deceives Judah himself, conceives by him, and in due time bears him twins, Pharez and Zarah.

(iii) One of these twins also grows to maturity, and has two sons, Hezron and Hamul, born to him, before Jacob goes down into Egypt.

19. The above being certainly incredible, we are obliged to conclude that one of the two accounts must be untrue. Yet the statement, that Hezron and Hamul were born in the land of Canaan, is vouched so positively by the many passages above quoted, which sum up the 'seventy souls,' that, to give up this point, is to give up an essential part of the whole story. But then, this point cannot be maintained, however essential to the narrative, without supposing that the other series of events had taken place beforehand, which we have seen to be incredible.

20. THE FAMILY OF MOSES.

'And Moses was content to dwell with the man; and he gave Moses Zipporah his daughter, and she bare him a son, and he called his name Gershom; for he said, I have been a stranger in a strange land.' E.ii.21,22.

Proceeding a step further in the history, we find here also, apparently, a great inconsistency. Moses 'was grown,' E.ii.11—'full forty years old,' Acts vii.23,—when he slew the Egyptian, immediately after which event he fled to Midian, where he 'was content to dwell with the man,' Jethro, and married his daughter. When, however, he returned to Egypt, we are told that he was *eighty* years old, E.vii.7, and then he had two sons, E.xviii.3, *young children*, whom he 'set upon an ass' with their mother,

E.iv.20, and one of whom their mother circumcised by the way, E.iv.25.

21. We must, consequently, suppose either that Moses, though already forty years old, lived nearly forty years with Jethro before he took Zipporah to wife, —although the story would lead us to conclude that she was one of the 'seven daughters' of Jethro, whom Moses, at his first coming to Midian, 'helped' at the well, and 'watered their flock,' E.ii.17,—or else that Moses lived with Zipporah nearly forty years before she bore him her first child. But these suppositions are both of them at variance with the plain, natural, meaning of E.ii.21,22, as quoted above, from which we should infer,—unless we choose to force another meaning upon it,—that Moses married Zipporah soon after he had consented to dwell with Jethro, and that Gershom was born to him in due course of time after his marriage. And so the name of his *second* son, 'Eliezer' 'God is a help,' is expressly said to have been given,—

'because the God of my Father, said he, was mine help, and delivered me from the sword of Pharaoh,' E.xviii.4,—

which also points to a recent escape from danger in Egypt, and not to a deliverance wrought for him nearly forty years ago.

CHAPTER III.

THE NUMBER OF THE CONGREGATION.

22. 'And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, . . . Gather thou all the Congregation together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. And Moses did as Jehovah commanded him. And the Assembly was gathered together unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation.' L.viii.1-4.

First, it appears to be certain that by the expressions used so often, here and elsewhere, 'the Assembly,' 'the whole Assembly,' 'all the Congregation,' is meant the whole body of the people—or, at all events, the *adult males in the prime of life* among them—and not merely the *elders* or *heads of the people*, as some have supposed, in order to escape from such difficulties as that which we are about to consider.

'The whole Assembly of the Congregation of Israel shall kill it in the evening,' E.xii.6.

'The whole Congregation of the Children of Israel murmured against Moses and Aaron in

the wilderness; and the children of Israel said unto them, . . . Ye have brought us forth into this wilderness, to kill this *whole Assembly* with hunger.' E.xvi.2,3.

'Take ye the sum of *all the Congregation* of the children of Israel,' N.i.2.

Korah 'gathered *all the Congregation* against Moses and Aaron, unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation; and the glory of Jehovah appeared unto *all the Congregation*. . . . And Moses rose up, and went unto Dathan and Abiram, and the *elders of Israel* followed him,' N.xvi.19,25,—

where the 'elders' are plainly distinguished from 'all the Congregation,' as are the 'princes' from 'all the Assembly,' in the following passage:—

'When they shall blow with them (the two trumpets), *all the Assembly* shall assemble themselves to thee at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation; and, if thou blow but with one trumpet, then the *princes*, which are heads of the thousands of Israel, shall gather themselves unto thee.' N.x.3,4.

23. Now the men in the prime of life, 'above twenty years of age,' N.i.3, were more than 600,000 in number. We may reckon that the women in the prime of life were about as many, the males under twenty years, 300,000, the females under twenty years, 300,000, and the old people, male and female together, 200,000, making the whole number about two millions. This number is, indeed, a very moderate estimate. In HORNE's *Introd.* ii.p.205, they are reckoned to have formed 'an aggregate of upwards of three millions.' Accordingly, CÆSAR, *Bell. Gall.* i.29, says that the Helvetii numbered 92,000 men capable of bearing arms, whilst their whole population 'including children, old men, and women,' amounted to 368,000 souls, or exactly four times the former number. In short, for general purposes, we may fairly compare the whole body of Israelites, together with the 'mixed multitude,' E.xii.38, to the entire population of LONDON, which was 2,362,236, by the census of 1851, increased to 2,803,035, by that of 1861.

24. This vast body of people, then, received on this occasion, and on other similar occasions, as we are told, an express command from Jehovah Himself, to assemble 'at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation.' Of course, no one would suppose that *every individual* would be able to attend such a summons, or would be expected to do

so. Many might be prevented by sickness, many by accidental circumstances, and others by other claims of duty. Yet still the number of persons implied in the expression, 'all the Congregation,' the 'whole Assembly,' must surely be understood to *bear some reasonable proportion to the whole number*. At all events, the great body of the 603,550 warriors *ought*, we must believe, to have obeyed such a Divine command, and hastened to present themselves at the 'door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation.'

25. And so says Dr. McCaul, *Examination of Part I*, p.17,—

The whole congregation was convoked or summoned—[i.e. 'not merely the 600,000 adult males, but women and children,' as he 'freely admits.'] And all thus convoked, who were not prevented, turned out of their tents to assist at a great national ceremony, the consecration of Aaron's Priesthood.

Supposing, then, with him, p.18,—

that as many as could of this great multitude stood at the door,—that the princes, elders, and officers, had the precedency,—that the rest stood behind and about, with their faces turned to the Tabernacle, knowing what was going on, and expecting some manifestation of the Lord's Presence,—

let us try to realise more distinctly, by the aid of a numerical example, to what this statement amounts,—the prodigious number of people here concerned, and the incredibility of the fact which is here narrated.

26. Now the whole width of the *Tabernacle* was 10 cubits or 18 feet, reckoning the cubit at 1·824 feet, and its length was 30 cubits or 54 feet. Allowing two feet in width for each full-grown man, nine men could just have stood in front of it. Supposing, then, that 'all the Congregation' of adult males in the prime of life had given due heed to the Divine Summons, and had hastened to take their stand, side by side, as closely as possible, in front of the whole *end* of the Tabernacle, in which the door or entrance was, they would have reached, allowing 18 inches between each rank of nine men, for a distance of more than 100,000 feet,—in fact, nearly *twenty miles!* or, if we reckon, with Dr. McCaul, the old men, women, and children, for a distance of more than *sixty miles!* It is surely inconceivable

that such an enormous congregation—the warriors alone being nearly *twice the whole population of MANCHESTER*,—should have been summoned expressly by Jehovah Himself, to attend for the purpose of witnessing a ceremony, taking place in a tent eighteen paces long and six wide, which could only have been seen by a few standing at the door.

27. 'These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel,' D.I.I.

'And Moses called all Israel, and said unto them,' D.v.i.

'And afterward he read all the words of the Law, the blessings and the cursings, according to all that which is written in the Book of the Law. There was not a word of all that Moses commanded, which Joshua read not before all the Congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them.' Jo.viii.34,35.

We have just seen that 'all the Congregation of Israel, with the women, and the little ones, and the strangers that were conversant among them,' may be reasonably compared to the whole population of London. How, then, is it conceivable that a man should do what Joshua is here said to have done, unless, indeed, the reading every 'word of all that Moses commanded,' with 'the blessings and cursings, according to all that is written in the book of the Law,' was a mere dumb show, without the least idea of those most solemn words being *heard* by those to whom they were addressed? For, surely, no human voice, unless strengthened by a miracle of which the Scripture tells us nothing, could have reached the ears of such an enormous body of people, however they might be arranged. Under favourable circumstances, many thousands, perhaps, might hear the voice of a speaker. But imagine the whole population of London addressed at one time by one man!

28. It may be said, indeed, that only a portion of this great host was really present, though 'all Israel' is spoken of. And this might have been allowed without derogating from the general historical value of the book, though, of course, not without impeaching the *literal* accuracy of the Scripture narrative, which by some is so strenuously maintained. But the words above

quoted from Joshua are so comprehensive, as to imply that, at least, the *great body* of the Congregation was present, and not only present, but able to hear the words of awful moment which Joshua addressed to them. And the expressions of D.xxix.10,11, are still more decisive on this point:—

'Ye stand this day, all of you, before Jehovah your God,—your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, all the men of Israel,—your little ones, your wives, and the stranger that is in thy Camp, from the hewer of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water.'

29. Thus in the 'Morning Herald' report of the entrance of GARIBALDI into LONDON there occurs the following passage:—

LONDON turned out to a man—and a woman—and a child—along the route from Nine Elms to Stafford House.

We accept this as a fair rhetorical description of the immense mass of people, which welcomed the Italian hero: though even that enormous crowd was after all but a small fraction of 'all LONDON;' and we will suppose that, when Moses 'called all Israel,' D.xxix.2, to hear his last words, the numbers who attended at the summons, and who are recognised in the above passage, D.xxix.10,11, as actually standing before him, did not in reality exceed some such small fraction of the whole population of Israel. Yet who could believe that GARIBALDI addressed at one time the multitude of human beings, that crowded the roads for three miles, from Nine Elms to St. James's Park?—or that a host like this, large enough to throng Hyde Park from one end to the other, could have assembled—much less, could have been summoned to assemble—in order that a few standing in front might witness what was passing at the door of his host's house in Prince's Gate? In short, while it is conceivable that a later writer, *imagining* such scenes as these, may have employed such exaggerated expressions as occur in the above passages, it cannot be believed that an *eye-witness, with the actual facts of the case before him*, could have expressed himself in such extravagant language.

CHAPTER IV.

THE CAMP AND THE PRIEST'S DUTIES.

30. *'And the skin of the bullock, and all his flesh, with his head, and with his legs, and his inwards, and his dung, even the whole bullock, shall he (the Priest) carry forth without the Camp, unto a clean place, where the ashes are poured out, and burn him on the wood with fire. Where the ashes are poured out, there shall he be burnt.'* L.iv.11,12.

'And the Priest shall put on his linen garment, and his linen breeches shall he put upon his flesh, and take up the ashes which the fire hath consumed with the burnt offering on the Altar, and he shall put them beside the Altar. And he shall put off his garments, and put on other garments, and carry forth the ashes without the Camp unto a clean place.' L.vi.10,11.

We have seen (23) that the whole population of Israel at the Exodus may be reckoned at two millions. Now we cannot well allow for a *living* man, with room for his cooking, sleeping, and other necessities and conveniences of life, less than three or four times the space required for a *dead* one in his grave. And even then the different ages and sexes would be very disagreeably crowded together. Let us allow, however, for each person on the average three times 6 feet by 2 feet, the size of a coffin for a full-grown man,—that is, let us allow for each person 36 square feet or four square yards. Then it follows that for two millions of people, (without making any allowance for the Tabernacle itself, and its Court, and the 44,000 Levites, male and female, N.iii.39, 'who pitched round about it,' N.i.53,) the Camp must have covered, the people being crowded as thickly as possible, an area of 8,000,000 square yards, or more than 1,652 acres of ground.

31. Upon this very moderate estimate, then, (which in truth is far within the mark,) we must imagine a vast encampment of this extent, swarming with people, more than a *mile and a half across* in each direction, with the Tabernacle in the centre. And so says JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* III.xii.5:—

It was like a well-appointed market; and everything was there ready for sale in due order; and all sorts of artificers were in the shops; and it resembled nothing so much as a city, that sometimes was moveable, and sometimes was fixed.

Thus the refuse and ashes of these

sacrifices would have had to be carried out for a distance of three-quarters of a mile. And it would seem, from the second of the passages above quoted, that *the Priest himself in person* was to do this, or, at least, to superintend the business of doing it. From the outside also of this great camp, wood and water would have had to be fetched for all purposes, if, indeed, such supplies of wood or water, for the wants of such a multitude as this, could have been found at all in the wilderness,—under Sinai, for instance, where they are said to have encamped for nearly twelve months together. How much wood would remain in such a neighbourhood, after a month's consumption of the city of LONDON, even at mid-summer? And the 'ashes,' &c., of the whole camp, for a population like that of LONDON, would have had to be carried out in like manner, through the midst of the crowded mass of people. They could not surely all have gone outside the camp for the necessities of nature. There were the aged and infirm, women in childbirth, sick persons, and young children, who could not have done this.

32. But, indeed, the very fact, that provisions for ensuring cleanliness, such as that laid down in D.xxiii.12-14,—
'for Jehovah thy God walketh in the midst of thy camp; therefore shall thy camp be holy, that He see no unclean thing in thee, and turn away from thee,'—

would have been so limited in their application, is itself a very convincing proof of the unhistorical character of the whole narrative. It is true that this particular direction is laid down, as appears from the context, with special reference to a moveable camp of soldiers engaged in a military expedition. Yet how much more necessary must some such a provision have been, for the vast *stationary* camp of two millions? Or, rather, how is it conceivable that such a camp could have existed without any sewage arrangements, without even the assistance for this purpose of a small running stream of water? And what would such a stream have been to the whole population of London?

33. But how huge does this difficulty become, if, instead of taking the exces-

sively cramped area of 1652 acres, less than *three square miles*, for such a Camp as this, we take the more reasonable allowance of the Rev. T. SCOTT, who says, 'this encampment is computed to have formed a moveable city of *twelve miles square*,' that is, about the size of LONDON itself,—as it might well be, considering that the population was as large as that of LONDON, and that in the Hebrew tents there were no first, second, third, and fourth stories, no crowded garrets and underground cellars! In that case, the offal of these sacrifices would have had to be carried a distance of six miles; and the same difficulty would have attended each of the other transactions above-mentioned. In fact, we have to imagine the Priest* having himself to convey,—we may suppose, with the help or by the hands of others,—from St. Paul's to the outskirts of the Metropolis, the 'skin, and flesh, and head, and legs, and inwards, and dung, even the whole bullock,' and the people having to carry out their rubbish in like manner, and bring in their daily supplies of water and fuel, after first cutting down the latter where they could find it! Further, we

* There probably was at Jerusalem some place 'outside the camp,' i.e. outside the wall of the city, where 'the ashes were poured out,' and whither, in *David's* or *Solomon's* time and afterwards, the remains of certain sacrifices were actually carried, by one or more of the officiating priests or their attendants. See 2Ch.xxix.16, 'and the priests went into the inner part of the House of Jehovah, and brought out all the uncleanness that they found in the Temple of Jehovah into the court of the House of Jehovah. And the Levites took it, to carry it abroad into the brook Kidron.' And compare Heb.xiii.11,12,—'For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the High Priest for sin, are burned *without the camp*. Wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the people with His own blood, suffered *without the gate*.'

It is inconceivable that any lawgiver, with the actual camp before him, as large and populous as LONDON, could have laid down such directions as those in L.iv.11,12.vi.10,11, for the priest. It is, however, conceivable that a writer, living (suppose) in *David's* or *Solomon's* days, and wishing to connect the practices which actually existed in those times with those which might be supposed to have existed in the wilderness,—not having, therefore, the Camp itself before his eyes, but only *imagining* the state of things in question—should, for want of due consideration, have committed such an inadvertence as this.

have to imagine half a million of men going out daily,—the 22,000 Levites for a distance of *six miles*,—from St. Paul's to the suburbs, for the common necessities of nature!

CHAPTER V.

THE ISRAELITES NUMBERED, DWELLING IN TENTS, AND ARMED.

34. THE ISRAELITES NUMBERED.

'And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, When thou takest the sum of the children of Israel after their number, then shall they give every man a ransom for his soul unto Jehovah when thou numberest them, that there be no plague among them when thou numberest them. This they shall give, every one that passeth among them that are numbered, half a shekel after the shekel of the Sanctuary; (a shekel is twenty gerahs;) an half shekel shall be the offering of Jehovah.' E.xxx. 11-13.

The expression, 'shekel of the Sanctuary,' in the above passage, or, as some render it, 'sacred shekel,' could hardly have been used in this way until there *was* a Sanctuary or sacred system in existence, or, rather, until it had been *some time* in existence, and such a phrase had become *familiar* in the mouths of the people. Whereas here it is put into the mouth of Jehovah, speaking to Moses on Mount Sinai, six or seven months before the Tabernacle was made. Some, however, suppose that the words 'a shekel is twenty gerahs,' which *appear* like a later note of explanation, are a Divine definition of the shekel for the first time.

35. But these words direct that, whenever a numbering of the people should take place, each one that is numbered should pay a 'ransom for his soul' of half a shekel. Now in E.xxxviii. 26 we read of such a tribute being paid,—

'A bekah for every man, that is, half a shekel after the shekel of the Sanctuary, for every one that went to be numbered, from twenty years old and upward.'

Here, then, it seems, the *atonement-money* is collected; but nothing is said of any *census* being taken. On the other hand, in N.i.1-46, more than six months after the date of the former occasion, we have an account of a very formal numbering of the people, the result being given for each particular

tribe, and the total number summed up at the end. And here, therefore, the *census* is made, but there is no indication of any *atonement-money* being paid. The omission in each case might be considered, of course, as accidental, it being supposed that, in the first instance, the numbering really took place, and in the second the tribute was paid, though neither circumstance is mentioned.

36. But then it is surprising that the number of adult males should have been *identically the same* (603,550) on the first occasion as it was half a year afterwards. And each account professes to be a strictly accurate account of the numbers in question,—the first being *checked*, as it were, and verified, *thrice over*, in E.xxxviii, viz. in v.25, where the silver paid is reckoned in talents and shekels, in v.26, where the number of men is given, and in v.27,28, where the separate portions of silver are specified, which were devoted to different purposes,—and the second being verified, in like manner, by the numbers of the tribes being repeated *twice over*, and summed up in different ways, N.i.ii.

37. In this interval of six months, had none arrived at maturity, i.e. 'twenty years,' N.i.3, who would be numbered at the census, but would not have paid the atonement-money? Or, of those who had *died* or become *superannuated* in this interval, out of a population as large as that of London, where the mortality (of all ages) is 1250 weekly, were there none who had paid the 'atonement-money,' but would not be numbered at the census? Or must we suppose that the number of super-numeraries in the one case was miraculously ordered so as to *exactly* balance that in the other?

38. THE ISRAELITES DWELLING IN TENTS.

'Take ye every man for them which are in his tents.' E.xvi.16.

Here we find that, immediately after their coming out of Egypt, the people were provided with *tents*,—cumbrous articles to have been carried, when they fled out in haste,—

'Taking their dough before it was leavened,

their kneading-troughs being bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders,' E.xii.34.

It is true, this statement conflicts strangely with that in L.xxiii.42,43, where it is assigned as a reason for their 'dwelling in booths' for seven days at the Feast of Tabernacles,—

'That your generations may know that I made the children of Israel to dwell in *booths*, when I brought them out of the land of Egypt.'

39. There is no indication, however, in the story that they ever did live in booths, nor is it conceivable when they could have done so. For it cannot surely be supposed that, in the hurry and confusion of this flight, they had time to cut down 'boughs and bushes' to make booths of, if even there were trees from which to cut them. But, however this may be, they must have needed from the first some kind of shelter from the heat and cold, and privacy in some way or other for the necessities of social life. And we are required to believe that *they had tents*, at all events, as these are repeatedly mentioned in the story; whereas booths are only spoken of in this single passage of the book of Leviticus.

40. Now, allowing *ten* persons for each tent,—(a Zulu hut in Natal contains on an average only *three and a half*),—two millions of people would require 200,000 tents. How then did they acquire these? Had they provided this enormous number in expectation of marching, when all their request was to be allowed to go 'for three days into the wilderness,' E.v.3? For they were not living in tents in the land of Egypt, as we gather from the fact, that they were to take of the blood of the paschal lamb, and 'strike it on the *two side-posts*, and on the *lintel or upper door-post*,' of their houses, E.xii.7, and none of them was to 'go out at the *door of his house* until the morning,' v.22.

41. But, further, if they had had these tents, how could they have *carried* them? They could not have borne them on their shoulders, since these were already occupied with other burdens. And these burdens themselves were by no means insignificant. For, besides their 'kneading troughs,' with the dough unleavened,

'bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders,' as well as all other necessities for daily domestic use, for sleeping, cooking, &c., there were the infants and young children, who could scarcely have gone on foot twenty miles a day as the story requires; there were the aged and infirm persons, who must have likewise needed assistance; they must have carried also those goods of various kinds, which they brought out of their treasures so plentifully for the making of the Tabernacle; and, above all this, *they must have taken with them grain or flour enough for at least a month's use*, since they had no manna given to them till they came into the wilderness of Sin,—

'On the fifteenth day of the second month after their departing out of the land of Egypt,' E.xvi.1.

42. There were the *cattle* certainly, which might have been turned to some account for this purpose, if trained to act as pack-oxen. But then what a prodigious number of trained oxen would have been needed to carry these 200,000 tents! One ox will carry 120 lbs., and a *canvas* tent, 'that will hold *two* people and a fair quantity of luggage,' weighs from 25 to 40 lbs. (GALTON'S *Art of Travel*, pp.33,177). Of such tents as the above, with poles, pegs, &c., a single ox might, possibly, carry *four*, and even this would require 50,000 oxen. But these would be of the lightest modern material, whereas the Hebrew tents, we may suppose, were made of *hair*. E.xxvi.7, xxxvi.14, or, rather, of *skin*, E.xxvi.14, xxxvi.19, and were, therefore, of course, much heavier. Also, these latter were *family* tents, not made merely for soldiers or travellers, and required to be very much larger for purposes of common decency and convenience. One ox, perhaps, might have carried one such a tent, large enough to accommodate ten persons, with its apparatus of pole and cords: and thus they would have needed for this purpose 200,000 oxen. But oxen are not usually trained to carry goods upon their backs as pack-oxen, and will by no means do so if untrained.

43. THE ISRAELITES ARMED.

'The children of Israel went up *harnessed* out of the land of Egypt.' E.xiii.18.

The Hebrew word which is here rendered 'harnessed,' appears to mean 'armed' or 'in battle array,' in all the other passages where it occurs, *viz.*—

Jo.i.14, 'But ye shall pass before your brethren *armed*, all the mighty men of valour, and help them;

Jo.iv.12, 'And the children of Reuben, and the children of Gad, and half the tribe of Manasseh, passed over *armed* before the children of Israel, as Moses spake unto them;

Ju.vii.11, 'Then went he down, with Phurah his servant, unto the outside of the *armed* men that were in the host.'

44. It is, however, inconceivable that this down-trodden, oppressed people should have been allowed by Pharaoh to possess arms, so as to turn out at a moment's notice 600,000 armed men. If such a mighty host,—nearly nine times as great as the whole of Wellington's army at Waterloo, —(69,686 men, ALISON'S *History of Europe*, xix.p.401),—had had arms in their hands, would they not have risen long ago for their liberty, or, at all events, would there have been no danger of their rising? Besides, the warriors formed a distinct caste in Egypt, as HERODOTUS tells us, ii. 165,— 'being in number, when they are most numerous, 160,000, none of whom learn any mechanical art, but apply themselves wholly to military affairs.'

Are we to suppose, then, that the Israelites acquired their arms by 'borrowing' on the night of the Exodus? Nothing whatever is said of this, and the idea itself is an extravagant one. But, if even in this, or in any other, way they had come to be possessed of arms, is it to be believed that 600,000 armed men, in the prime of life, would have cried out in panic terror, 'sore afraid,' E.xiv.10, when they saw that they were being pursued?

45. The difficulty of believing this has led many commentators to endeavour to explain otherwise, if possible, the meaning of the word. Accordingly, in the margin of the English Bible we find suggested, instead of 'harnessed' or 'armed,' in all the above passages except Jo.iv.12, 'by five in a rank.' And others again explain it to mean 'by fifties,' as the five thousand were arranged in the wilderness of Bethsaida, Mark vi.40.

46. It will be seen, however, that

these meanings of the word will not at all suit those other passages. And, indeed, by adopting the first of them, we should only get rid of one difficulty to introduce another quite as formidable. For, if 600,000 men marched out of Egypt 'five in a rank,' allowing a yard for marching room between each rank, they must have formed a column 68 miles long, and it would have taken several days to have *started* them all off, instead of their going out altogether 'that self-same day,' E.xii. 41,42,51. On the second supposition, they might have formed a column seven miles long, which was certainly possible in the open, undulating, desert between Cairo and Suez. But it cannot surely be supposed that the strong, able-bodied, men kept regular ranks, as if marching for war, when they were only hasting out of Egypt, and when their services must have been so much required for the assistance of the weaker members of their families, the women and children, the sick, infirm, and aged.

47. It has been suggested, indeed, that the Hebrew word may have been used originally of warriors, with reference to their marching in ranks of five or fifty, but may here be used in a metaphorical sense, to express the idea that they went out of Egypt 'with a high hand,' E.xiv.8, in a spirited and orderly manner, not as a mere hurrying, confused, rabble.

48. But, if this be admitted, we must still ask where did they get the armour, with which, about a month afterwards, they fought the Amalekites, E.xvii. 8-13, and 'discomfited them with the edge of the sword'? And whence came the 'swords' and 'weapons' mentioned in E.xxxii.27, D.i.41? It may, perhaps, be said that they had stripped the Egyptians, whom they saw 'lying dead upon the sea-shore,' E.xiv.30. And so writes JOSEPHUS *Ant.* II. xvi. 6:—

On the next day, Moses gathered together the weapons of the Egyptians, which were brought to the camp of the Hebrews by the current of the sea and the force of the winds assisting it. And he conjectured that this also happened by Divine Providence, that so they might not be destitute of weapons.

It is plain that JOSEPHUS had per-

ceived the difficulty. The Bible-story, however, says nothing about this stripping of the dead, as surely it must have done, if it really took place. And, though body-armour might have been obtained in this way, would swords, and spears, and shields, in any number, have been washed upon the shore by the waves, or have been retained, still grasped in the hands of drowning men?

49. If, then, the historical veracity of this part of the Pentateuch is to be maintained, we must believe that 600,000 men in the prime of life, of whom some portion at least were armed, had, by reason of their long servitude, become so debased and inhuman in their cowardice,—(and yet they fought bravely enough with Amalek a month afterwards.)—that they could not strike a single blow for their wives and children, if not for their own lives and liberties, but could only weakly wail, and murmur against Moses, saying,—

‘It had been better for us to serve the Egyptians, than that we should die in the wilderness.’ E.xiv.12.

CHAPTER VI.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE PASSOVER.

50. ‘Then Moses called for all the elders of Israel, and said unto them, Draw out, and take you a lamb according to your families, and kill the Passover. And ye shall take a bunch of hyssop, and dip it in the blood that is in the bason, and strike the lintel and the two side-posts with the blood that is in the bason; and none of you shall go out at the door of his house until the morning. . . . And the children of Israel went away, and did as Jehovah had commanded Moses and Aaron: so did they.’ E.xii.21-28.

That is to say, in *one single day*, the whole immense population of Israel, as large as that of LONDON, was instructed to keep the Passover, and actually did keep it. I have said ‘in one single day’; for the first notice of any such Feast to be kept is given in v.3 of this very chapter, and we find it written in v.12,—

‘I will pass through the land of Egypt *this night*, and will smite all the first-born in the land of Egypt, both man and beast.’

51. It is true that the story, as it now stands, with the directions about ‘taking’ the lamb on the tenth day, and ‘keeping’ it till the fourteenth, is perplexing and contradictory. But this is only one of many similar phe-

nomena, arising, as will appear hereafter, from interpolations having been made by a later writer in the original document.

Let us now see what the above statement really implies, when translated into simple every-day matter of fact.

52. ‘Moses called for all the elders of Israel.’

We must suppose, then, that the ‘elders’ must have lived somewhere near at hand. But where did the two millions live? And how could the order, to keep the Passover, have been conveyed, with its minutest particulars, to *each individual household* in this vast community, in one day,—rather, in *twelve hours*, since Moses received the command on the very same day, on which they were to kill the Passover *at even*, E.xii.6?

53. It must be observed that it was absolutely necessary that the notice should be distinctly given to each separate family. For it was a matter of life and death. Upon the due performance of the Divine command it depended whether Jehovah should ‘pass-over,’ *i. e.* ‘stride across,’ the threshold, (Is.xxxi.5), and protect the house from the angel of death, or not.

54. And yet the whole matter was perfectly new to them. The specific directions,—about choosing the lamb, killing it at even, sprinkling its blood, eating it with unleavened bread,—

‘not raw, nor sodden at all with water, but roast with fire,’ ‘with their loins girded, their shoes on their feet, and their staff in their hand,’—

were now for the first time communicated to Moses, by him to the elders, and by them to the people. These directions, therefore, could not have been conveyed by any mere *sign*, intimating that they were now to carry into execution something about which they had been informed before. They must be plainly and fully delivered to each individual head of a family, or to a number of them gathered together; though these, of course, might be ordered to assist in spreading the intelligence to others, but so that no single household should be left uninformed upon the matter.

54. This would, of course, be done *most* easily, if we could suppose that

the whole Hebrew community lived as closely together as possible, in one great city. In that case, we should have to imagine a message of this nature, upon which life and death depended, conveyed, without fail, to every single family in a population as large as that of LONDON, between sunrise and sunset,—and that, too, without their having had any previous notice whatever on the subject, and without any preparations having been made beforehand to facilitate such a communication.

55. Further, we are told that—

‘Every woman was to borrow of her neighbour, and of her that sojourned in her house, jewels of silver, and jewels of gold, and raiment.’ E.iii.22.

From this it would seem to follow that the Hebrews were regarded as living in the midst of the Egyptians, mixed up freely with them in their dwellings. And this appears to be confirmed by the statement, E.xii.35,36, that, when suddenly summoned to depart, they hastened, at a moment’s notice, to ‘borrow’ in all directions from the Egyptians, and collected such a vast amount of treasure, in a very short space of time, that they ‘spoiled the Egyptians.’

56. But the supposition of their borrowing in this way, even if they lived in such a city, involves prodigious difficulties. For the city, in that case, could have been no other than Rameses itself, from which they started, E.xii.37, a ‘treasure-city,’ which they had ‘built for Pharaoh,’ E.i.11—doubtless, therefore, a well-built city, not a mere collection of mud-hovels. But, if the Israelites lived in such a city together with the Egyptians, it must have been even larger than LONDON, and the difficulty of communication would have been thereby greatly increased. For we cannot suppose that the humble dwellings of these despised slaves were in closest contiguity with the mansions of their masters. And, in fact, several of the miracles, especially that of the ‘thick darkness,’ imply that the abodes of the Hebrews were wholly *apart* from those of the Egyptians, however difficult it may be to conceive how, under such circumstances, each woman could have

borrowed from her that ‘sojourned in her house.’ Thus we should have now to imagine the time that would be required for the poorer half of LONDON going hurriedly to borrow from the richer half, in addition to their other anxieties in starting upon such a sudden and momentous expedition.

57. The story, however, will not allow us to suppose that they were living in any such city at all. Having so large flocks and herds, ‘even very much cattle,’ E.xii.38, many of them must have lived scattered over the large extent of grazing-ground, required under their circumstances; and, accordingly, they are represented as still living in ‘the land of Goshen,’ E.ix.26. But how large must have been the extent of this land? We can form some judgment on this point by considering the number of lambs, which (according to the story) must have been killed for the Passover, for which the command was,—

‘They shall take to them every man a lamb, according to the house of their fathers, a lamb for an house: and, if the household be too little for the lamb, let him and his neighbour, next unto his house, take it according to the number of the souls; every man, according to his eating, shall make your count for the lamb,’ E.xii.3,4.

58. Now JOSEPHUS (*Jew. War*, VI. ix.3) reckons *ten* persons on an average for each lamb; but, he says, ‘an many of us are twenty in a company.’ KURTZ allows *fifteen* or *twenty*. Taking *ten* as the average number, two millions of people would require about 200,000 lambs; taking *twenty*, they would require 100,000. Let us take the mean of these, and suppose that they required 150,000. And these were to be all ‘male lambs of the first year,’ E.xii.5. We may assume that there were as many *female* lambs of the first year, making 300,000 lambs of the first year altogether.

59. But these were not all. For, if the 150,000 lambs that were killed for the Passover comprised *all* the males of that year, there would have been no rams left of that year for the increase of the flock. And, as the same thing would take place in each successive year, there would never be any rams or wethers, but ewe-sheep innumerable.

Instead, then, of 150,000, we may suppose 200,000 male lambs of the first year, and 200,000 female lambs, making 400,000 lambs of the first year altogether. Now a sheepmaster, experienced in Australia and Natal, informs me that the total number of sheep, in an average flock of all ages, will be about *five times* that of the increase in one season of lambing. So that 400,000 lambs of the first year implies a flock of 2,000,000 sheep and lambs of all ages. Taking, then, into account the fact, that they had also large herds, 'even very much cattle,' we may fairly reckon that the Hebrews, though so much oppressed, must have possessed at this time, according to the story, more than two millions of sheep and oxen.

60. What extent of land, then, would all these have required for pasturage? Having made enquiries on the subject from experienced sheepmasters, I find that in *New Zealand* there are a few spots, where sheep can be kept *two* to the acre; in other places, *one* can be kept per acre; but, generally, two acres are obliged to be allowed for one sheep. Another writes as follows:—

In *Australia*, some sheep-runs are estimated to carry *one* sheep to an acre, and these, I think, are of the *best* quality. Others are estimated at different numbers of acres to a sheep, until as many as *five* acres are allowed for *one* sheep by the Government, for the purposes of assessment. *Natal* is able to support a much greater number, principally from its climate, as well as from the fact that the proportion of good land is incomparably greater with reference to the extent of poor land. But I think that I am within the mark, when I say that *three* sheep will hereafter be found to be supported by an acre of land.

Let us allow *five* sheep, or goats, *Ex.ii.5*, to an acre. Then the flocks alone of the Israelites would have required 400,000 acres of grazing land,—an extent of country considerably larger than the whole county of Hertfordshire or Bedfordshire, and more than twice the size of Middlesex,—besides that which would have been required for the herds of oxen.

61. We must, then, abandon altogether the idea of the people living together in one city, and must suppose a great body of them to have been scattered about in towns and villages, throughout the whole land of Goshen, in a

district of 400,000 acres, that is, twenty-five miles square, larger than Hertfordshire (391,141 acres). But then the difficulty of informing such a population would be enormously increased, as well as that of their borrowing, when summoned in the dead of night, *Ex.ii.29-36*, to the extent implied in the story. For, even if we supposed the *first* message, to prepare, kill, and eat the Paschal lamb, communicated to the whole people within the twelve hours, and acted on, when they were abroad in full daylight,—or that they actually had had a previous order, several days before as some suppose, to 'take' the lambs on the tenth day, and 'keep' them to the fourteenth,—yet how could the *second* notice, to start, have been so suddenly and completely circulated?

62. Let us look at this matter more closely. We are told that not one was 'to go out at the door of his house until the morning,' *Ex.ii.22*. Consequently, they could not have known anything of what had happened in Pharaoh's house and city, as also among his people throughout the whole 'land of Egypt,' *Ex.ii.29*, until the summons from Moses, or, at least, the news of the event, reached each individual house. The whole population of Hertfordshire, by the census of 1851, was considerably under 200,000 (167,298). We are to imagine then its towns and villages increased more than *tenfold* in size or in number. And then we are to believe that every single household, throughout the entire county, was warned in twelve hours to keep the Feast of the Passover, was taught *how* to keep it, and actually *did* keep it!

63. Or, even if we suppose that they were warned and taught to keep the Passover some days previously, yet still the story represents that this vast population, spread over a large extent of country,* was warned again suddenly at midnight, to start in hurried flight

* Allowing even that *one* lamb or kid sufficed for a *hundred* persons, as some have asserted, it would still follow, as above, that the people would be spread over 53,333 acres of land.

for the wilderness, and started in obedience to the order, after 'borrowing' of their masters 'jewels' and 'raiment,'—when each family was shut up closely in its own house, and strictly forbidden to come out of it till summoned, and they could not, therefore, communicate the tidings freely, as by day, from one person to a number of others. That they *did* start suddenly in 'hurried flight,' according to the story, is manifest from the statement in E.xii.39,—

'They baked unleavened cakes of the dough which they brought forth out of Egypt, for it was not leavened; because they were thrust out of Egypt, and could not tarry, neither had they prepared themselves any victual.'

CHAPTER VII.

THE MARCH OUT OF EGYPT.

64. '*And the children of Israel journeyed from Rameses to Succoth, about six hundred thousand on foot that were men, besides children. And a mixed multitude went up also with them, and flocks and herds, even very much cattle.*' E. xii.37,38.

It appears from N.i.3,ii.32, that these 'six hundred thousand on foot, were the men in the prime of life,—

'From twenty years old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war in Israel.'

And, (as we have seen,) this large number of able-bodied warriors implies a total population of, at least, two millions. Here, then, we have this vast body of people of all ages, summoned to start, according to the story, at a moment's notice, and actually started, not one being left behind, together with all their multitudinous flocks and herds, which must (60) have been spread out over a district as large as a good-sized English county. I do not hesitate to declare this statement to be utterly incredible and impossible. Were an English village of (say) two thousand people to be called suddenly to set out in this way, with old people, women, young children, and infants, what indescribable distress there would be! But what shall be said of a thousand times as many? And what of the sick and infirm, or the women in recent or imminent childbirth, in a population like that of LONDON, where the births* are

264 a day, or *about one every five minutes?*

65. But this is but a very small part of the difficulty. We are required to believe that, in one single day, the order to start was communicated suddenly, at midnight, to every single family of every town and village, throughout a tract of country as large as Hertfordshire, but ten times as thickly peopled;—that, in obedience to such order, having first 'borrowed' very largely from their Egyptian neighbours in all directions, (though, if we are to suppose Egyptians occupying the same territory with the Hebrews, the extent of it must be very much increased,) they then came in from all parts of the land of Goshen to Rameses, bringing with them the sick and infirm, the young and the aged;—further, that, since receiving the summons, they had sent out to gather in all their flocks and herds, spread over so wide a district, and had driven them also to Rameses;—and, lastly, that having done all this, since they were roused at midnight, they were started again from Rameses that very same day, and marched on to Succoth, not leaving a single sick or infirm person, a single woman in childbirth, or even a 'single hoof,' E.x.26, behind them!

66. And now let us see them on the march itself. If we imagine the *people* to have travelled through the open desert, in a wide body, fifty men abreast, as some suppose to have been the practice in the Hebrew armies, then, allowing an interval of a yard between each rank, the able-bodied warriors alone would have filled up the road for about *seven miles*, and the whole multitude would have formed a dense column more than *twenty-two miles long*,—so that the last of the body could not have been started till the front had advanced that distance, more than two days' journey for such a mixed company as this.

67. And the sheep and cattle—these must have formed another vast column, but obviously covering a much greater tract of ground in proportion to their number, as they would not march, of course, in compact order. Hence the

* The births in LONDON, for a week taken at random (*Times*, Sept. 3, 1862), were 1,852, and the deaths, 1,147.

drove must have been lengthened out for many long miles. And such grass as there was, if not eaten down by the first ranks, must have been trodden under foot at once and destroyed, by those that followed them mile after mile. What, then, did those two millions of sheep and oxen live upon, during this journey from Rameses to Succoth, and from Succoth to Etham, and from Etham to the Red Sea?

68. Even if we supposed with some, contrary to the plain meaning of the Scripture, that they did not all rendezvous at Rameses, but fell into the line farther on, on the first day or the second, still this would not in reality in any way relieve the difficulty, of so many miles of people marching with so many miles of sheep and oxen. It would only throw it on to a farther stage of the journey. For when, on the third day, they turned aside and 'encamped by the Sea,' E.xiv.2, what then did this enormous multitude of cattle—whether 2,000,000 or (say) 200,000 or even 20,000—feed upon? KIRTO, *Hist. of the Jews*, p.177, says,—

The journey to this point had been for the most part over a desert, the surface of which is composed of hard gravel, often strewed with pebbles.

What, again, did they eat the next day, when they crossed the Sea? What on the next three days, when they marched through the wilderness of Shur, and 'found no water,' E.xv.22? Of this last stage KIRTO says, *ib.p.* 191:—

Their road lay over a desert region, sandy, gravelly, and stony, alternately. In about nine miles they entered a boundless desert plain, called *Et Ati*, white and painfully glaring to the eye. Proceeding beyond this, the ground became hilly, with sand-hills near the coast.

69. They had not 'prepared for themselves any victual,' E.xii.39: much less, we must believe, had they prepared food for their cattle. Who, indeed, could suppose that, when they started with 'their kneading-troughs bound up in their clothes upon their shoulders,' (showing their want of carts, &c., to convey their common necessities,) they carried also bundles of forage for their flocks and herds? Or were the oxen so laden with forage, that they could not also carry the

kneading-troughs? Afterwards, indeed, as they advanced into the wilderness, we are told how the *people* were supplied with manna, E.xvi.35. But there was no miraculous provision of food for the herds and flocks. They were left to gather sustenance, as they could, in that inhospitable wilderness. We will now go on to consider the possibility of such a multitude of cattle finding any means of support, for forty years, under these circumstances.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE FLOCKS AND HERDS IN THE DESERT.

70. And, first, it is certain that the story represents them as *possessing* these flocks and herds during the whole of the forty years which they spent in the wilderness. Thus, in the *second* year, Moses asks,—

'Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them to suffice them?' N.xi.22.

And in the *fortieth* year we read,—

'The children of Reuben and the children of Gad had a very great multitude of cattle,' N.xxxiii.1.

This, it is true, is said immediately after the capture of a great number of cattle and sheep from the Midianites, N.xxxi. But the spoil in that case was divided among all the people. And, therefore, if the tribes of Reuben and Gad could still be distinguished among the rest, as having a great multitude of cattle, they must have been so noted before the plunder of the Midianites. Accordingly, we find that, at the end of the *first* year, they kept the second Passover under Sinai, N.ix.5, and, therefore, we may presume, had at that time, as before, 200,000 male lambs or kids of the first year (59) at their command, and two millions of sheep and oxen close at hand.

71. Again, it cannot be supposed, as some have suggested, that the flocks and herds were scattered far and wide, during the sojourn of the people in the wilderness, and so were able the more easily to find pasture. The story says nothing, and implies nothing, whatever of this; but, as far as it proves anything, it proves the contrary, since we find the whole body of the people together, on all occasions specified in the

history. If, indeed, they had been so dispersed, they would surely have required to be guarded, by large bodies of armed men, from the attacks of the Amalekites, Midianites, and others.

72. But, even if this was the case during the thirty-seven years, about which the story is silent altogether, yet, at all events, during nearly twelve months, they were all collected under Sinai, while the Tabernacle was in process of building, at the end of which time the second Passover was kept. We must, therefore, conclude that they came to Sinai with those immense bodies of sheep and oxen, with which, three months before, they had set out from Egypt. Hence we find the command in E.xxxiv.3,—

‘Neither let the flocks nor herds feed before that mount.’

73. Lastly, it cannot be said that the state of the country, through which they travelled, has undergone any material change from that time to this. It is described as being then what it is now, a ‘desert land,’ a ‘waste howling wilderness,’ D.xxxii.10.

‘Why have ye brought up the Congregation of Jehovah into this wilderness, that we and our cattle should die there? And wherefore have ye made us to come up out of Egypt, to bring us unto this evil place? It is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates; *neither is there any water to drink;*’ N.xx.4,6.

From the above passage it appears also that the water from the rock did *not* follow them in all places, as some have supposed.

‘Beware that thou forget not Jehovah, thy God, who led thee through that great and terrible wilderness, wherein were fiery serpents, and scorpions, and drought, *where there was no water*, who brought thee forth water out of the rock of flint.’ D.viii.15.

‘Neither said they, ‘Where is Jehovah, that brought us up out of the land of Egypt, that led us through the wilderness, through a land of deserts and of pits, through a land of drought and of the shadow of death, through a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt?’ Jer.ii.6.

74. Let us now see what Dean STANLEY tells us, first, as to the nature of the country, through which the host of Israel must have marched from the Red Sea to Sinai. (*Sinai and Palestine.*)

The wind drove us to shore—the shore of Arabia and Asia. We landed in a driving sand-storm, and reached this place, Ayun-

Musa, the wells of Moses. It is a strange spot, this plot of tamarisks, with its seventeen wells, *literally an island in the desert*, and now used as the Richmond of Suez, a comparison which chiefly serves to show what a place Suez itself must be. Behind that African range lay Egypt, with all its wonders,—the green fields of the Nile, the immense cities, the greatest monuments of human power and wisdom. *On this Asiatic side begins immediately a wide circle of level desert, stone, and sand, free as air, but with no trace of human habitation or art, where they might wander, as far as they saw, for ever and ever.* And, between the two, rolled the deep waters of the Red Sea, rising and falling with the tides, which, except on its shores, none of them could have seen,—the tides of the great Indian Ocean, unlike the still dead waters of the Mediterranean Sea.

The day after leaving Ayun-Musa was at first within sight of the blue channel of the Red Sea. But soon Red Sea and all were lost in a sand-storm, which lasted the whole day. (I have retained this account of the sand-storm, chiefly because it seems to be a phenomenon peculiar to this special region. VAN EGMONT, NIEBUHR, MISS MARTINEAU, all noticed it; and it was just as violent at the passage of a friend in 1841, and again of another two months after ourselves in 1853.) Imagine all distant objects entirely lost to view,—the sheets of sand floating along the surface of the desert, like streams of water, the whole air filled with a tempest of sand, driving in your face like sleet.

We were, undoubtedly, on the track of the Israelites; and we saw the spring, which most travellers believe to be Marah, and the two valleys, one of which must almost certainly—both perhaps—be Elim. The general scenery is either immense plains, [*i.e. bare and barren plains of sand*, as described below,] or, latterly, a succession of watercourses, [*without water*, see below,] exactly like the dry bed of a Spanish river. These gullies gradually bring you into the heart of strange black and white mountains. *For the most part the desert was absolutely bare.* But the two rivals for Elim are fringed with trees and shrubs, the *first vegetation we have met in the desert*. First, there are the wild palms, successors of the ‘three-score and ten,’ not like those of Egypt or of pictures, but either dwarf, that is, trunkless, or else with savage, hairy trunks, and branches all dishevelled. Then there are the feathery tamarisks, here assuming gnarled boughs and hoary heads, on whose leaves is found what the Arabs call manna. Thirdly, there is the wild acacia, but this is also tangled by its desert growth into a thicket,—the tree of the Burning Bush and the Shittim-wood of the Tabernacle. . . A stair of rock brought us into a glorious wady, enclosed between red granite mountains, descending precipitously upon the sands. I cannot too often repeat that these wadys are exactly like rivers, *except in having no water*; and it is this appearance of torrent-bed and banks, and clefts in the rocks for tributary streams, and at times even rushes and shrubs fringing their course, which gives to the whole wilderness a doubly dry and thirsty aspect,—signs of ‘Water, water, everywhere, and not a drop to drink.’

Here too began the curious sight of the mountains, streaked from head to foot, as if with boiling streams of dark red matter poured over them—really, the igneous fluid spurted upwards, as they were heaved from the ground. The road lay through what seemed to be the ruins, the cinders, of mountains calcined to ashes, like the heaps of a gigantic foundry. p.96–71.

There are at first sight many appearances, which, to an unpractised eye, seem indications of volcanic agency. But they are all, it is believed, illusory. The vast heaps, as of calcined mountains, are only the detritus of iron in the sandstone formation. The traces of igneous action in the granite rocks belong to their first upheaving, not to any subsequent convulsions. Everywhere there are signs of the action of water, nowhere of fire. p.22.

75. Such, then, is the track, along which, according to the story, the two millions of Israelites had to pass with their two millions of sheep and oxen. Let us now see what Dean STANLEY tells us about the vegetation generally in the Sinaitic peninsula.

Another feature [of the mountains of this peninsula] is the infinite complication of jagged peaks and varied ridges. This is the characteristic described by Sir F. HENNIKER, with a slight exaggeration of expression, when he says that the view from Jebel Musa is 'as if Arabia Petraea were an ocean of lava, which, while its waves were running mountains high, had suddenly stood still.' It is an equally striking and more accurate expression of the same, when he speaks of the whole range as being the 'Alps unclothed.' This—their union of grandeur with desolation—is the point of their scenery absolutely unrivalled. They are the Alps of Arabia, but the Alps planted in the desert, and, therefore, stripped of all the clothing which goes to make up our notions of Swiss or English mountains,—stripped of the variegated drapery of oak, and birch, and pine, and fir, of moss, and grass, and fern, which to landscapes of European hills are almost as essential as the rocks and peaks themselves. The very name of Alp is strictly applied only to the green pasture-lands, enclosed by rocks or glaciers,—a sight in the European Alps so common, in these Arabian Alps so wholly unknown. p.13.

The general character of the wadys, as well as of the mountains, of Sinai is *entire desolation*. If the mountains are naked Alps, the valleys are dry rivers, p.16. For a few weeks or days in the winter, these wadys present, it is said, the appearance of rushing streams. But their usual aspect is absolutely bare and waste, only presenting the image of thirsty desolation the more strikingly, from the constant indications of water, which is no longer there. p.15.

There is nearly everywhere a *thin*, it might almost be said, a *transparent*, coating of vegetation. There are occasional spots of verdure, which escape notice in a general view, but for that very reason are the more remarkable, when observed. Not, perhaps, every single

tree, but every group of trees, lives in the traveller's recollection, as distinctly as the towns and spires of civilized countries. . . .

The more definitely marked spots of verdure, however, are the accompaniments, not of the empty beds of winter torrents, but of the few living, perhaps perennial, springs, which, by the mere fact of their rarity, assume an importance difficult to be understood in the moist scenery of the West and North. The springs, whose sources are for the most part high up in the mountain clefts, occasionally send down into the wadys rills of water, which, however scanty, however little deserving of the name even of brooks, yet become immediately the nucleus of whatever vegetation the desert produces. (RUPPELL notices *four* perennial brooks.) Often their course can be traced, not by visible water, but by a track of moss here, a fringe of rushes there, a solitary palm, a group of acacias, which at once denote that an unseen life is at work. p.15-18.

The highest of these [peaks of Mount Serbal] is a huge block of granite. On this you stand, and overlook the whole peninsula of Sinai. Every feature of the extraordinary conformation lies before you,—the wadys, coursing and winding in every direction,—the long crescent of the Wady es Sheikh,—the infinite number of mountains like a model, their colours all clearly displayed, the dark granite, the brown sandstone, the yellow desert, the dots of vegetation along the Wady Feiran, and the one green spot of the great palm-grove (if so it be) of Rephidim. p.72.

76. We thus see the character of the desert of Sinai, in which this immense number of cattle was sustained, according to the story, for the space of forty years. Dean STANLEY will not, however, evade the difficult question, which is thus raised; and this is his comment upon it, p.23–27, with the replies which must be made to the different parts of his argument.

(i) 'The question is asked, 'How could a tribe, so numerous and powerful, as on any (?) hypothesis the Israelites must have been, be maintained in this inhospitable desert? It is no answer to say that they were maintained by miracles. For, except the manna, the quails, and the three interventions with regard to water, none such are mentioned in the Mosaic history; and, if we have no warrant to take away, we have no warrant to add.'

Ans. But, even if the people were supported by miracles, yet there is no provision whatever made in the Scripture for the support of the cattle. And these would need *water* as well as green food; and from N.xx.5 it appears that the *miraculous* supply of water was not *permanent*.

(ii) 'Nor is it any answer to say that this difficulty is a proof of the impossibility, and, therefore, of the unhistorical character, of the narrative. For, as EWALD has well shown, the general truth of the wanderings in the wilderness is an essential preliminary to the whole of the subsequent history of Israel.'

Ans. EWALD certainly asserts this; but

where does he *show* it? The story of the Exodus is, no doubt, an 'essential preliminary' to *certain recorded parts* of the subsequent history of Israel, but not to the whole, even of the recorded history. If that story be shown to be untrue, those parts may also have to be abandoned as untrue, but not the whole Jewish history.

(iii) 'Much may be allowed for the spread of the tribes of Israel far and wide through the whole peninsula, and also for the constant means of support from their own flocks and herds.'

Ans. Can any allowance be made for such spreading (71)? The Mosaic narrative says nothing of any such a dispersion of the people. And, surely, the whole tone of it implies that they were kept constantly together, under the direct personal control of Moses. As before observed, if the cattle had been scattered in the way here supposed, they would have needed to be guarded by large bodies of armed men, from the attacks of other hostile tribes. But the numbers of the warriors of each tribe are carefully summed up in N.i.ii; and the position of each camp is assigned in N.x, with distinct directions how they were to march, in front, and in the rear, and on either side of the Levites bearing the Tabernacle. How otherwise, indeed, could the different camps have been started by the mere blowing an 'alarm' upon a silver trumpet, N.x.5,6, or the 'whole congregation' have been 'gathered together' by blowing simply without an 'alarm,' v.7?

Besides which, it seems to be clearly implied in N.ix.17-23 that they travelled all together, and were not separated into different bodies. 'When the cloud was taken up from the Tabernacle, then after that the *children of Israel* journeyed; and in the place, where the cloud abode, there the children of Israel pitched their tents.' 'Whether it were two days, or a month, or a year, that the cloud tarried upon the Tabernacle, remaining thereon, the *children of Israel* abode in their tents, and journeyed not; but, when it was taken up, they journeyed.' Who, in these verses, are meant by 'the children of Israel'? Plainly, the same who, a few verses before, in the same chapter, are ordered to keep the second Passover in the wilderness of Sinai, N.ix.1,2,—that is, the whole body of the people. Such words as the above cannot surely be understood only of Moses and Aaron and the Tabernacle, guarded, perhaps, by a troop of armed men, going about in circuit continually to visit the different scattered knots of families.

But, at all events, they were all, according to the story, assembled together under Mount Sinai, in one of the most desolate parts of the whole peninsula; and they continued there for nearly twelve months, and had their flocks there, since at the end of that time they kept the second Passover, N.ix.5.

Doubtless, they may be supposed to have derived some support from the slaughter of their flocks and herds. The question is, how were the flocks and herds themselves supported?

(iv) Something, too, might be elicited from the undoubted fact, that a population nearly, if not quite, equal to the whole permanent population of the peninsula, does actually pass

through the desert, in the caravan of the five thousand African pilgrims on their way to Mecca.'

Ans. But the population, which we are now considering, was *two millions*, not *five thousand*.

And these two millions of all ages had been driven out of Egypt in haste, and 'had not prepared for themselves any victual,' and had no means of carrying food, if they had had it. Whereas the Mecca caravan will, no doubt, have made all due preparation for the journey long beforehand, and will carry with it, we must suppose, ample store of provisions on the backs of its camels.

Again, the two millions remain twelve months at a time in one most desolate spot, and wander forty years in the dry and weary land. Whereas the caravan merely passes through in a few days at the most.

Lastly, the Israelites had, according to the story, vast multitudes of cattle, which had to be sustained in the desert without miraculous help. But the caravan has no flocks or herds, and travels with camels, which can go for weeks without water.

(v) 'But, among these considerations, it is important to observe what indications there may be of the mountains of Sinai having ever been able to furnish greater resources than at present. These indications are well summed up by RITTER.'

Ans. Whatever they may be, they cannot do away with the plain language of the Bible already quoted, which shows that the general character of the desert was as desolate and barren then as now.

(vi) 'There is no doubt that the vegetation of the wadys has considerably decreased. In part, this would be an inevitable effect of the violence of the winter-torrents. The trunks of palm-trees washed up on the shore of the Dead Sea, from which the living tree has now for many centuries disappeared, show what may have been the devastation produced among these mountains, where the floods, especially in earlier times, must have been violent to a degree unknown in Palestine; whilst the peculiar cause, the impregnation of salt, which has preserved the vestiges of the older vegetation *there*, has *here*, of course, no existence. The traces of such destruction were pointed out by BUCKHARDT on the eastern side of Mount Sinai, as having occurred within half a century before his visit; also to WELLSTED, as having occurred near Tur in 1832.'

Ans. That palm-trees are found, washed up on the shores of the Dead Sea, into which they found their way, no doubt, from the river Jordan, gives surely no shadow of ground for believing that such trees, or any other, grew in the wilderness of Sinai. Dean STANLEY himself writes of the Dead Sea, p.293,—

'Strewn along its desolate margin, lie the most striking memorials of this last conflict of life and death,—trunks and branches of trees, torn down from the thickets of the river-jungle by the violence of the Jordan, thrust out into the sea, and thrown up again by its waves.'

It does not appear *why* the floods are supposed to have been more violent in earlier times than now. But, supposing that they were, and much more violent than in Pales-

tine, and that BURCKHARDT and WELLSTED saw the traces of the devastation caused by them, it is notorious that the flood of one year, by the deposit which it leaves, rather assists than otherwise the vegetation of the next year. A few trees may be washed away; but the *general verdure*, which concerns most the present question of the *cattle*, would be promoted by a heavy fall of rain.

(vii) 'In fact, the same result has followed from the reckless waste of the Bedouin tribes—reckless in destroying, and careless in replenishing. A fire, a pipe, lit under a grove of desert trees, may clear away the vegetation of a whole valley. . . . Again, it is mentioned by RUPPEL, that the acacia trees have been of late years ruthlessly destroyed by the Bedouins for the sake of charcoal; especially since they have been compelled by the Pasha of Egypt to pay a tribute in charcoal, for an assault committed on the Mecca caravan in the year 1823. Charcoal is, in fact, the chief—perhaps, it might be said, the *only*—traffic of the peninsula. Camels are constantly met, loaded with this wood, on the way between Cairo and Suez. And, as this probably has been carried on to a great degree by the monks of the convent, it may account for the fact, that, whereas in the valleys of the eastern clusters this tree abounds more or less, yet in the central cluster itself, to which modern tradition certainly, and geographical considerations probably, point as the mountain of the 'burning thorn,' and the scene of the building of the Ark and all the utensils of the Tabernacle, *from this very wood*, there is now not a single acacia to be seen.'

Ans. It is possible that the *Ark* may have been made of the wood of this acacia, of which the Hebrews may have found a few trees in the desert. But it is certainly a very noticeable fact, that 'not a single acacia' is now to be seen in the very region, where, according to the story, not merely the *Ark*, with the vessels of the Tabernacle, but the Tabernacle itself, was built, with its forty-eight boards of shittim (acacia) wood, each 10 cubits by 1½ cubit, that is, 18½ ft. long by 2½ ft. broad, E.xxxvi.20-30. It may be doubted if the 'probable' labours of the monks, in burning charcoal during late years, are enough to account for such a complete disappearance of the tree. In Natal, trees of this kind are cut down for firewood; and, by wasteful or excessive cutting, a piece of good bushland may be stripped of all the trees, *which are fit for such a purpose*. But there will still remain a multitude of *young* trees and small *saplings*, which have sprung up from the seed shed by the old ones, and have not been cut down, because utterly useless as firewood.

Besides, the destruction of *trees* would not affect directly the growth of *grass*, on which the flocks and herds depended in the case of the Israelites, however (as Dean STANLEY suggests in the next passage) it might, perhaps, affect it indirectly, but surely to a very slight and almost inappreciable degree, by diminishing the quantity of moisture attracted to the land.

(viii) 'If this be so, the greater abundance of vegetation would, as is well-known, have furnished a greater abundance of water; and this again would react on the vegetation,

from which the means of subsistence would be procured.'

Ans. The general answer to the above is, that the Bible speaks of the desert in exactly the same terms as those, which would even now be used to describe it. Especially, the extreme scarcity of water is expressly noticed. It is plain, therefore, that the removal of a few acacias has not materially changed the face and character of the country.

(ix) 'How much may be done by a careful use of such water and such soil as the desert supplies, may be seen by the only two spots, to which, now, a diligent and provident attention is paid, namely the gardens at the Wells of Moses, under the care of the French and English agents from Suez, and the gardens in the valleys of Jebel Musa, under the care of the Greek monks of the convent of St. Catherine. Even so late as the seventeenth century, if we may trust the expression of MONCONYS, the Wady-er-Rahah, in front of the convent, now entirely bare, was a vast green plain, *une grande champagne verte*.'

And so writes SHAW, *Travels to the Holy Land*, ch.ii:—

'Though nothing that can be properly called soil is to be found in these parts of Arabia, these monks have, in a long process of time (N.B.) covered over, with dung and the sweepings of their convent, near four acres of these naked rocks, which produce as good cabbages, salads, roots, and all kinds of pot-herbs, as any soil and climate whatsoever. They have likewise raised apple, pear, plum, almond, and olive trees, not only in great numbers, but also of excellent kinds. Their grasses also are not inferior, either in size or flavour, to any whatsoever. Thus this little garden demonstrates how far an indefatigable industry may prevail over nature.'

Ans. But the fact, that, in a few favoured spots, by great care and industry, and in a long process of time, 'little gardens' like this have been raised, is no proof that in the peninsula generally, for forty years, and in particular at the foot of Sinai, for twelve months together, *at a moment's notice*, such an immense body of cattle could have been provided with the food and water they required. The expression of MONCONYS, 'if we may trust it,' may have reference to the 'thin transparent coating of vegetation,' of which STANLEY himself speaks (75). But, whatever it may mean, the desert was then, as it is now, a 'great and terrible wilderness,' a 'land of drought and of the shadow of death.'

(x) 'And that there was, in ancient times, a greater population than at present,—which would again, by thus furnishing heads and hands to consider and to cultivate these spots of vegetation, tend to increase and preserve them,—may be inferred from several indications.

'The Amalekites, who contested the passage of the desert with Israel, were—if we may draw an inference from this very fact, as well as from their wide-spread name and power, even to the time of Saul and David, and from the allusion to them in Balaam's prophecy, as 'the first of the nations,'—something more than a mere handful of Bedouins.'

Ans. If the Pentateuch be mainly unhistorical, we can take no account of the power

of the Amalekites, as described in it. In the story of Saul's dealing with them, 1S.xv, and David's, 1S.xxx, there is nothing to show that they were any other than a powerful Arab tribe, between which and Israel there was a deadly feud.

Besides, did the Amalekites live in the desert of Sinai? On the contrary, we have the express statement of the Prophet, that it was 'a land that no man passed through, and where no man dwelt,' Jer.ii.6.

(xi) 'The Egyptian copper-mines, and monuments, and hieroglyphics, in Surabit-el-Khadim and the Wady Mughareh, imply a degree of intercourse between Egypt and the peninsula in the earliest days of Egypt, of which all other traces have long ceased.'

Ans. This does not help to prove in any way that two millions of people, with their two millions of sheep and oxen, could have lived under Sinai for twelve months, and could have been maintained for forty years in a country, which was then described as 'a desert land, a waste howling wilderness.' Supplies of corn were, no doubt, forwarded regularly by the king of Egypt for his workmen; and they had no vast flocks and herds that we know of.

(xii) 'The ruined city of Edom, in the mountains east of the Arabah, and the remains and history of Petra itself, indicate a traffic and a population in these remote regions, which now seem to us almost inconceivable.'

Ans. Dean STANLEY himself writes, p. 87:—

'The first thing that struck me, in turning out of the Arabah, up the defiles that lead to Petra, was that we had suddenly *left the desert*. Instead of the absolute nakedness of the Sinaitic valleys, we found ourselves walking on grass, sprinkled with flowers, and the level platforms on each side were filled with sprouting corn. And this continues through the whole descent to Petra, and in Petra itself.'

He elsewhere describes Petra, p.94, as 'an oasis of vegetation in the desert hills.'

There was a reason, therefore, for Petra maintaining a certain amount of population in former days, as it might do now, which does not exist for the valleys of Sinai. But, even then, Petra had no population to support like that of Israel, and no such multitudinous flocks and herds.

(xiii) 'And even much later times, extending to the sixth and seventh centuries of our era, exhibit signs both of movements and habitations, which have long ago ceased, such as the writings of Christian pilgrims on the rocks, whether in the Sinaitic character, in Greek, or in Arabic, as well as the numerous remains of cells, gardens, chapels, and churches, now deserted and ruined, both in the neighbourhood of Jebel Musa and Serbal.'

Ans. But the fact of a few thousand pilgrims paying a passing visit to such places, bringing, probably, supplies of food with them, or of a number of monks and hermits contriving to live in the neighbourhood of one or two favoured spots, avails little to show how Israel could have lived under Sinai itself for so many months together, with such immense flocks and herds, or how

they could have marched to and fro in the peninsula, from station to station, journeying 'by day or by night, when the cloud was taken up,' and abiding in their tents, 'whether it were two days, or a month, or a year,' when the cloud rested, N.ix.18-23, but finding all along the necessary supplies of food, and wood, and water, for themselves and their cattle. The pilgrims and hermits needed only to find their own scanty fare: they had no flocks and herds as the Israelites.

Dean STANLEY adds in conclusion,—'It must be confessed that none of these changes solve the difficulty, though they may mitigate its force. But they, at least, help to meet it: and they must under any circumstances be borne in mind, to modify the image, which we form to ourselves, of what must have always been—as it is even thus early described to be—'a great and terrible wilderness.'

77. I have the more closely examined and carefully weighed the above arguments, because we may be certain that, by so able and earnest an advocate, every thing has been said, that well could be said, to make it in any way credible, that the means of support could have been found for so large a body of cattle in the peninsula of Sinai, without a special miracle, of which the Bible says nothing. The reader will be able to judge for himself to what these arguments really amount, even when most fully and favourably stated.

78. But it may be well now to quote one or two passages from other writers, which yet more plainly develop the absolute barrenness of this wild and desolate region, as it now appears, and as, we have every ground from the Bible itself to believe, it must *then* have appeared also.

In *winter*, when the whole of the upper Sinai is *deeply covered with snow*, and many of the passes are choked up, the mountains of Moses and Saint Catherine are often inaccessible. Mr. FAZAKERLY, who ascended them in the month of February, found a great deal of snow, and the ascent was severe. 'It is difficult,' he says, 'to imagine a scene more desolate and terrific, than that which is discovered from the summit of Sinai. A haze limited the prospect, and, except a glimpse of the sea in one direction, nothing was within sight but snow, huge peaks, and crags of naked granite.' Of the view from Mount Saint Catherine, he says, 'The view from hence is of the same kind, only much more extensive than from the top of Sinai. It commands the two gulfs of Akaba and Suez; the island of Tiran and the village of Tur were pointed out to us; Sinai was far below us; all the rest, wherever the eye could reach, was *a vast wilderness, and a confusion of granite mountains and valleys destitute of*

verdure.' CONDER's *Modern Traveller*, Arabia, p.159,160.

79. We have here another question raised, which is not generally taken into consideration at all. The Israelites, according to the story, were under Sinai for nearly twelve months together, and they kept the second Passover under the mountain before they left it, N.ix.1. As this was in the first month of the Jewish ecclesiastical year, corresponding to the latter part of March and beginning of April, they must have passed the whole of the winter months under Sinai, and must have found it bitterly cold.

In the mountainous districts it is very cold in the winter nights. Sometimes the water in the garden of the monastery at Saint Catherine freezes even in February. And, on the contrary, in the summer months, the sun pours down his rays burning hot from heaven, and in reflection from the naked rocky precipices, into the sandy valleys. RUPPEL, quoted in HENGSTENBERG's *Balaam*, Clark's Theol. Library, p.338.

80. Where, then, amidst the scanty vegetation of the neighbourhood, where at the present time there seems not to grow a single tree fit for firewood,—and there is no reason to suppose that it was ever otherwise,—did the Israelites obtain supplies of fuel, not only for the daily cooking necessities of a population like that of London, but also for relief against the piercing cold of the winter season, or when, as JOSEPHUS says, *Ant.* III.vii.4, 'the weather was inclined to snow'? And the cattle,—unless supplied with artificial food—must they not also have perished in multitudes from cold and starvation under such circumstances? We find this to be the case even in the fertile colony of Natal, where in some winter seasons they die from these joint causes in great numbers, when the grass, though abundant, is dried up, and the cold happens to be more severe than usual, though not severe enough for ice and snow, except in the higher districts, and then only for a month or six weeks in the year.

81. If the last quotations describe the state of things in the depth of winter, the following, (in addition to the words of RUPPEL, above quoted,) will convey some idea of the general

aspect of the country in the height of the summer season. It would seem that travellers generally choose the most favourable season of the year for visiting these desert regions. We must make due allowance for this fact also, in considering even their accounts of the desolate barrenness of the whole district, with reference to the story told in the Pentateuch.

BURCKHARDT visited Um Shamer, the loftiest mountain in the peninsula, and writes of the scene as follows. 'The devastations of torrents are everywhere visible, the sides of the mountains being rent by them in numberless directions. The surface of the sharp rocks is blackened by the sun; all vegetation is dry and withered; and the whole scene presents nothing but utter desolation and hopeless barrenness.' CONDER's *Arabia*, p.199.

He afterwards travelled from the neighbourhood of Sinai eastward, across the peninsula, to the gulf of Akaba. But, he says, 'the barrenness of this district exceeded anything we had yet witnessed, except some parts of the desert of El Tih [that is, the desert of Sinai]. The Nubian valleys might be called pleasure-grounds in comparison. Not the smallest green leaf could be discovered. And the thorny mimosa, which retains its verdure in the tropical deserts of Nubia with very little supplies of moisture, was here entirely withered, and so dry that it caught fire from the lighted ashes which fell from our pipes as we passed.' *Ibid.* p.204.

BURCKHARDT also says, *Syria*, p. 560:—

I believe that the population of the entire peninsula does not exceed 4,000 souls. In years of dearth, even this small number is sometimes at a loss to find pasturage for their cattle. . . . Their herds are scanty, and they have few camels.

82. As to the little spots of greater luxuriance, which are found here and there in the Sinaitic peninsula, the above traveller says of one of them,—

It affords good pasturage in spring, but has no water, and is therefore little frequented by the Bedouins;

and of another,—

I was told that very good water is found at about two miles to the east of this valley; and of a third,—

The owners seldom visit this place, except in the date-harvest.

What provision would such as these afford for the vast herds and flocks of the Israelites, in the drought of summer, or in the cold winter season?

83. But, indeed, we may form some idea of their character, and of the fitness of any one of them to sustain even for a

single day such a vast multitude of cattle, from the following description by BURCKHARDT of Wady Kyd, 'one of the most noted date-valleys of the Sinai Arabs.' This valley he entered, and pursued its windings, till he came in an hour's time to a small rivulet, two feet across and six inches in depth, 'which is lost immediately below in the sands of the Wady.'

It drips down a granite rock, which blocks up the valley, there only twenty paces broad, and forms at the foot of the rock a small pond, overshadowed by trees, with fine verdure on its banks. The rocks, which overhang it on both sides, almost meet, and give to the whole the appearance of a grotto, most delightful to the traveller, after passing through these dreary valleys. . . . Beyond it we continued in the same narrow valley, along the rivulet, amidst groves of date, nebek, and some tamarisk trees, until [in half an hour] we reached the source of the rivulet. The contrast of its deep verdure with the glaring rocks, by which it is closely hemmed in, is very striking, and shows that, wherever water passes in these districts, however barren the ground, vegetation is invariably found. . . . Beyond the spot, where the rivulet oozes out of the ground, vegetation ceases, and the valley widens. . . . Notwithstanding its verdure, however, Wady Kyd is an uncomfortable halting-place, on account of the great number of gnats and ticks, with which it is infested. *Ibid.* p. 218.

84. Bearing in mind that two millions of sheep and oxen, allowing a space of three feet by two feet as *standing* ground for each, would require, when packed together as closely as in a pen in a cattle-market, nearly 300 acres of land, it seems idle to expend more time in discussing the question, whether these, or a much smaller number, could have been supported in the wilderness by the help of such wadies as these, which a hundred oxen would have trampled down into mud in an hour.

CHAPTER IX.

THE LAND OF CANAAN: THE NUMBER OF FIRSTBORNS.

85. THE LAND OF CANAAN.

'I will send my fear before thee, and will destroy all the people to whom thou shalt come, and I will make all thine enemies turn their backs unto thee. And I will send hornets before thee, which shall drive out the Hivite, the Canaanite, and the Hittite, from before thee. I will not drive them out from before thee in one year, lest the land become desolate, and the beast of the field multiply against thee. By little and little I will drive them out from before thee, until thou be increased and inherit the land.' E. xxiii. 28-30.

The whole land, which was divided among the tribes in the time of Joshua, including the countries beyond the Jordan, was in extent about 11,000 square miles, or 7,000,000 acres. (*KITTO'S Geogr. of the Holy Land, Knight's series, p. 7.*) And, according to the story, this was occupied by more than two millions of people.

86. Now the following is the extent of the three English agricultural counties of Norfolk, Suffolk, and Essex, with the population according to the census of 1851:—

	Acres.	Pop. in 1851.
Norfolk contains.	1,354,301	442,714
Suffolk	947,681	337,215
Essex	1,060,549	369,318
	<u>3,362,531</u>	<u>1,149,247</u>

By doubling the above results, we find that these counties of England were, at that time, about as thickly peopled as the land of Canaan would have been with its population of Israelites only, without reckoning the aboriginal Canaanites, who already filled the land. And surely it cannot be said that these three Eastern Counties, with their flourishing towns and innumerable villages, are in any danger of lying 'desolate,' with the beasts of the field multiplying against the human inhabitants.

87. But, perhaps, a still better comparison may be instituted with a country, which resembles in many respects, in its natural features and other circumstances, the state of Canaan in those early days. The colony of Natal has an extent of 18,000 square miles, and a population, white and black included, probably not exceeding 200,000 altogether. This population is, of course, very scanty, and the land will allow of a much larger one. Yet the human inhabitants are perfectly well able to maintain their ground against the beasts of the field. And, in fact, the lions, elephants, rhinoceroses, and hippopotami, which once abounded in the country, have long ago disappeared. Leopards, wild boars, hyænas, and jackals are killed occasionally in the bush. But many a white man may have lived for years in the colony, as I have done, and travelled about in all parts of

it, without seeing or hearing one. But the population of the land of Canaan, (2,000,000 inhabitants within less than 12,000 square miles, equivalent to 3,000,000 within 18,000 square miles,) would have been *fifteen times as thick* as that of Natal, (200,000 within 18,000 square miles,)—and this, without reckoning the old inhabitants, 'seven nations, *greater and mightier*, than, Israel itself, D.iv.38, vii.1, ix.1, xi.23.

88. THE NUMBER OF FIRST-BORNS.

'All the first-born males, from a month old, and upwards, of those that were numbered, were 22,273.' N.iii.43.

Let us see what this statement implies, when treated as a simple matter of fact. For this purpose I quote the words of Dr. KURTZ, who strenuously maintains the traditional view of the strict historical veracity of the Pentateuch.

If there were 600,000 males of twenty years and upwards, the whole number of males may be reckoned at 900,000, [he elsewhere reckons 1,000,000.] in which case there would be only *one* first-born to *forty-two* [forty-four] males. In other words, the number of boys in every family must have been on the average *forty-two*.—*Hist. of the Old Covenant*, iii.p.209.

This will be seen at once if we consider that the rest of the 900,000 males were *not* first-borns, and, therefore, each of these must have had one or other of the 22,273 as the first-born of his own family,—except, of course, any cases where the first-born of any family was a *daughter*, or was *dead*, of which we shall speak presently.

89. And these were not the first-born on the *father's* side, as MICHAELIS supposes, so that a man might have many wives and many children, but only one first-born, as was the case with Jacob himself. They are expressly stated to have been the first-born on the *mother's* side—'all the first-born that openeth the matrix,' N.iii.12. So that, according to the story in the Pentateuch, *every mother of Israel must have had on the average forty-two sons!*

90. How then is this difficulty to be explained? KURTZ says:—

'We must enquire whether there are no other means—(than that suggested by MICHAELIS, which the Scripture will not allow, as KURTZ admits,—) of explaining the fact,

that, on an average, there was only one first-born to forty-two males.'

And KURTZ is bold enough to say, 'There are plenty;' and proceeds to state them as follows.

(i) 'The first is the rarity of polygamy, which lessened the proportion of the first-born.'

Ans. KURTZ means to say that, if polygamy had prevailed among them, the difficulty would have been enormously increased, and, as he says himself, 'rendered perfectly colossal.' For, in that case, if a man had had four wives, and had had children by each of them, he must have had on the average *forty-two* sons by each. So, then, the rarity of polygamy, (which, indeed, KURTZ assumes without proof,) does not at all help to *lessen* the difficulty already existing in the incredible statement, that every mother in Israel had, on the average, *forty-two* male children.

(ii) 'A second is the large number of children to whom the Israelitish mothers gave birth.'

Ans. This, again, is assumed without proof, or, rather, directly in the face of all the facts which are given us, by which to judge of the size of the Hebrew families. We have no reason whatever to suppose, from the data which we find in the Pentateuch, that the mothers of Israel were prolific in any unusual degree. We read of one, two, three, &c. sons, just as in ordinary families, occasionally of six or seven, once of ten, G.xlvi. 21, but not of an *average* of ten, or fifteen, or twenty. The average in G.xlvi is *five* sons, and in E.vi it is *three*. And, as regards *daughters*, all the indications are *against* their being as numerous even as the sons. Jacob had only *one* daughter, G.xlvi.15; Asher had only *one*, G.xlvi.17; Amram had only *one*, N.xxvi.59; Zelophehad had *five*, but no sons, N.xxvi.33.

(iii) 'Thirdly, the constantly recurring expression, 'Every first-born that openeth the womb,' warrants the conclusion, that the first-born of the father was not reckoned, unless he was also the first-born of the mother.'

Ans. This would only apply to a very small number of cases, where a man had married a woman, who had borne children before he married her, and who had, therefore, been a widow or a harlot.

But, in point of fact, it does not affect the present question at all. The *woman's* first-born will still have been numbered, whoever the father was. And the result is, as before, that there are reckoned only 22,273 first-born sons of all the mothers of Israel, after one or other of whom the other males must all be ranged in their respective families, (except, as before, cases, where the first-born of a family was either a female or was dead,) so that each mother must have had on the average *forty-two* sons.

(iv) 'Fourthly, it leads also to the still more important assumption, that, if the first-born was a *daughter*, any son, that would be born afterwards, would not be reckoned at all among the first-borns. Now statistical tables

show that the first-born is more frequently a female than a male.'

Ans. But in the case of the Hebrews, according to the story in the Pentateuch, (whatever may be the case generally,) the first-born was much more frequently a male than a female. We have the instances of Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Jacob's twelve sons, (except Asher who had a daughter before going into Egypt, and she may have been his first-born child,) in each of which the first-born was a male. Amram's first-born, indeed, was a daughter, and Zelophehad had only daughters. As far, however, as we have any data to guide us, we should be justified in assuming that the number of the first-born males far exceeded that of the females.

But let us suppose that they were even equal in number,—that, in short, besides the 22,273 first-born males, there were also 22,273 first-born females. This, however, will not by any means get rid of, or at all diminish, the essential difficulty of the question now before us: it will only change the form of it. For, having now brought in the idea of the *daughters*, we must remember that, if there were 900,000 [1,000,000] males, there must have been about as many females. And 44,546 first-born children among a population of 1,800,000, would imply that each mother had, on the average, forty-two children, as before, but twenty-one sons and twenty-one daughters.

(v) 'Lastly, such of the first-born, as were themselves heads of families, were not reckoned at all as first-born, who had to be redeemed, but only their sons.'

Ans. This is a pure assumption, and unwarranted by anything that is found in the Scripture. The command in N.iii.40 is this, 'Number *all* the first-born of the males, from a month old and upward.' Hence, says KURTZ, very justly, 'if there had been any age, beyond which the numbering was not to go, [or, we may add, any class of persons, such as heads of families, who were to be excepted from it.] it would undoubtedly have been mentioned here. But there is nothing of the kind.'

Have we any reason to suppose that the first-born son of an Egyptian was exempt from death, because he was the head of a family? He was the first-born to his father, and therefore died, according to the story in Exodus, 'from the first-born of Pharaoh that sat on his throne, unto the first-born of the captive that was in the dungeon,' so that 'there was not a house where there was not one dead.' E.xii.29,30.

Besides, there is one fact, which seems by itself to imply that the 22,273 first-borns were intended to include *all* the first-born males of all ages, whether married men and heads of families or not, *viz.* this, that the 22,000 male Levites, of *all ages and conditions*, 'from a month old and upward,' whether heads of families or not, were substituted for 22,000 of the first-borns 'from a month old and upward,' the remaining 273 first-borns being redeemed with money, N.iii.39,45,46.

91. Thus not one of KURTZ's 'many ways' of relieving this difficulty is

really of any use whatever for that purpose. There is, indeed, one point, though he has not noticed it, which might help slightly to diminish it. In some families the first-born may have died before the numbering; some, too, who were born about the time of the birth of Moses, may have been killed by the order of Pharaoh. And, if all those, who may have thus died, be reckoned with the 22,273, the proportion of the remaining males, to be placed under each of the first-born, will be somewhat altered. Still, we cannot suppose any unusual mortality of this kind, without checking, in the same degree, the increase of the people. Let us, however, reckon that one out of four first-borns died, so that instead of 44,546 first-borns, male and female, there would have been, if all had lived, about 60,000. But even this number of first-borns, for a population of 1,800,000, would imply that each mother had on the average thirty children, fifteen sons and fifteen daughters. Besides which, the number of *mothers* must have been the same as that of the *first-borns*, male and female, including also any that had died. Hence there would have been only 60,000 child-bearing women to 600,000 men, so that only about one man in ten had a wife or children!

92. By this time, surely, great doubt must have arisen, in the minds of most readers, as to the historical veracity of some considerable portions of the Pentateuch. That doubt, I believe, will be confirmed into certainty, when it is seen to follow, as a direct consequence from the data of the Pentateuch itself, that there could not have been any such population as this, to come out of Egypt,—in other words, that the children of Israel, at the time of the Exodus, if only we attend carefully to the distinct statements of the narrative, could not possibly have amounted to two millions,—that, in fact, the whole body of warriors could not have been *two thousand*.

In order, however, to show this more clearly, we must first premise a few considerations, which are set forth in the following chapter.

CHAPTER X.

THE SOJOURNING IN EGYPT, AND THE EXODUS IN THE FOURTH GENERATION.

93. THE SOJOURNING IN EGYPT.

'Now the sojourning of the children of Israel, who dwelt in Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years.' E.xii.40.

The question, which we have here to consider, is this,—To what 'sojourning' do the above words refer? Do they refer to that of Jacob and his descendants in the land of Egypt *only*, or to the entire sojourning of them and their forefathers, Abraham and Isaac, 'in a strange land,' both in Canaan and Egypt, from the time when the promise of old was given to Abraham, and he 'sojourned in the land of promise, as in a strange country,' Heb.xi.9?

94. The verse above quoted, as it stands in the E. V., does not decide the question. But there is evidently something unusual and awkward in the manner, in which the phrase, 'who dwelt in Egypt,' enters into the above passage. And, in fact, the original words would be more naturally translated, (as in the Vulgate, Chald., Syr., and Arab. Versions,)—

'the sojourning of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in Egypt,'—

but for the serious difficulties which would thus arise.

95. In the first place, St. PAUL, referring to 'the covenant, that was confirmed before of God' unto Abraham, says,—

'The Law, which was four hundred and thirty years after, cannot disannul it.' Gal. iii.17.

It is plain, then, that St. PAUL in this passage dates the beginning of the four hundred and thirty years, not from the going down into Egypt, but from the time of the promise made to Abraham.

96. Again, in E.vi.16-20, we have given the genealogy of Moses and Aaron, as follows:—

'These are the names of the sons of Levi, according to their generations, Gershon, and Kohath, and Merari. And the years of the life of Levi were a hundred thirty and seven years.'

'And the sons of Kohath, Amram, and Izhar, and Hebron, and Uzziel. And the years of the life of Kohath were a hundred thirty and three years.'

'And Amram took him Jochebed, his father's

sister, to wife; and she bare him Aaron and Moses. And the years of the life of Amram were a hundred thirty and seven years.'

Now supposing that Kohath was only an *infant*, when brought down by his father to Egypt with Jacob, G.xlvi.11, and that he begat Amram at the very end of his life, when 133 years old, and that Amram, in like manner, begat Moses, when he was 137 years old, still these two numbers added to 80 years, the age of Moses at the time of the Exodus, E.vii.7, would only amount to 350 years, instead of 430.

97. Once more, it is stated in the above passage, that 'Amram took him Jochebed, his father's sister,'—Kohath's sister, and therefore, Levi's daughter, —'to wife.' And so also we read,—

'The name of Amram's wife was Jochebed, the daughter of Levi, whom (her mother) bare to him in Egypt.' N.xxvi.59.

Now Levi was one year older than Judah, and was, therefore, 43 years old (18), when he went down with Jacob into Egypt; and we are told above that he was 137 years old, when he died. Levi, therefore, must have lived, according to the story, 94 years in Egypt. Making here again the extreme supposition of his begetting Jochebed in the last year of his life, she may have been an infant 94 years after the migration of Jacob and his sons into Egypt. Hence it follows that, if the sojourn in Egypt was 430 years, Moses, who was 80 years old at the time of the Exodus, must have been born 350 years after the migration into Egypt, when his mother, even on the above extravagant supposition, would have been at the very least 256 years old!

98. It is plain, then, that the 430 years are meant, as St. PAUL understood, to be reckoned from the time of the call of Abraham, when he yet lived in the land of Haran. Thus, reckoning 25 years from his leaving Haran, G.xii.4, to the birth of Isaac, xxi.5,—60 years to the birth of Jacob, xxv.26,—130 years to the migration into Egypt, xlvii.9,—we have 215 years of sojourning in the land of Canaan, leaving just the same length of time, 215 years, for the sojourn in the land of Egypt.

We conclude, therefore, that the translation in the English Bible of Ex.ii.40, however awkwardly it reads, is correct as it stands, *if the Hebrew words themselves are correct*, as they appear in all manuscript and printed copies of the Pentateuch.

99. The Septuagint and Samaritan Versions, however, insert a few words, which are either a gloss to make the meaning of the passage more plain, or else are a translation of words, which existed in those copies of the Hebrew Bible, that were used for those Versions, though they are not found in our own. The Vatican copy of the Septuagint renders the passage thus:

'The sojourning of the children of Israel, which they sojourned in *Egypt and in the land of Canaan*, was 430 years.'

The Alexandrian has,—

'The sojourning of the children of Israel, which *they and their fathers* sojourned in *Egypt and in the land of Canaan*, was 430 years.'

The Samaritan has,—

'The sojourning of the children of Israel *and of their fathers*, which they sojourned in *the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt*, was 430 years.'

In fact, during all those 430 years, Abraham and his seed were, according to the story, sojourning as strangers 'in the land of promise as in a strange land,'—in a land which 'was not their own,' but for the present 'the possession of the Gentiles.'

100. And this agrees also substantially with the promise in G.xv.13-16, which is quoted by STEPHEN, Acts vii.6:

'Know of a surety that thy seed shall be a stranger, in a land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them, *four hundred years*. And also that nation, whom they shall serve, will I judge; and afterwards they shall come out with great substance. And thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age. But *in the fourth generation* they shall come hither again; for the iniquity of the Amorites is not yet full.'

At first sight, indeed, it would seem from the above that Abraham's descendants were to be afflicted for 400 years, in one land, such as Egypt, by one nation. But it is certain that they were *not* afflicted, according to the story, during *all* the time of their sojourn in Egypt. And hence it appears that the time here specified, 400 years, is meant to refer to the time during

which the 'Seed of Abraham' should be *sojourners* in a strange land, rather than to the oppression, which they were to suffer during some part of that sojourning. They lived as 'pilgrims and strangers' in the land of Canaan; and they were at times, no doubt, much more uncomfortable among the people of that land, G.xxvi.15-21, xxxiv, than they were in Egypt during the seventy years while Joseph yet lived (103), and, we may suppose, for some time after his death.

We believe, then, that the 400 years in the above passage are meant to date from the birth of Isaac, 'Abraham's seed,' from which to the Exodus there may be reckoned, as in (98), 405, or, in round numbers, 400, years.

101. THE EXODUS IN THE FOURTH GENERATION.

Again when it is said, G.xv.16, 'in the *fourth* generation they shall come hither again,' this seems to mean 'in the fourth generation,' reckoning from the time when they should leave the land of Canaan, and go down into Egypt. Thus we find Moses and Aaron in the fourth generation from the migration, viz.—

Jacob begat Levi,
Levi begat Kohath,
Kohath begat Amram,
Amram begat Aaron.

Or, as Jacob was so aged at the time of his descent into Egypt, and Moses and Aaron also, at the time of the Exodus, were advanced in life beyond the military age, we may reckon from those, as Levi, who went down into Egypt in the prime of life; and then the generation of Joshua, Eleazar, &c., in the prime of life, will be the fourth generation.

102. Accordingly, if we examine the different genealogies of remarkable men, which are given in various places of the Pentateuch, we shall find that, as a rule, the contemporaries of Moses and Aaron are descendants in the *third*, and those of Joshua and Eleazar in the *fourth*, generation, from some one of the *sons*, or *adult grandsons*, of Jacob, who went down with him into Egypt. Thus we have:—

	1st Gen.	2nd. Gen.	3rd Gen.	4th G n.	5th Gen.	
Levi . . .	Kohath	Amram	Moses	.	.	E.vi.16,18,20
Levi . . .	Kohath	Amram	Aaron	.	.	E.vi.16,18,20
Levi . . .	Kohath	Uzziel	Mishael	.	.	L.x.4.
Levi . . .	Kohath	Uzziel	Elzaphan	.	.	L.x.4.
Levi . . .	Kohath	Izhar	Korah	.	.	N.xvi.1.
Reuben . .	Pallu	Eliab	Dathan	.	.	N.xxvi.7-9.
Reuben . .	Pallu	Eliab	Abiram	.	.	N.xxvi.7-9.
Zarah . .	Zabdi	Carmi	Achan	.	.	Jo.vii.1.
Pharez . .	Hezron	Segub	Jair	.	.	1Ch.ii.21,22.
Levi . . .	Kohath	Amram	Aaron	Elezar	Phinehas	E.vi.23,25.
Pharez . .	Hezron	Ram	Amminadab	Elisheba	.	E.vi.23.
Pharez . .	Hezron	Ram	Amminadab	Nahshon	.	Ruth iv.18,19.
Pharez . .	Hezron	Caleb	Hur	Uri	Bezaleel	1Ch.ii.18-20.

103. Again, we are told that the children of Machir the son of Manasseh, were brought up upon Joseph's knees, G.1.23. Hence, as Joseph was 39 years old, when Jacob came down to Egypt (18, note), and died at the age of 110, G.1.22, having lived, therefore, 71 years after that event, we may assume that Machir's son, Gilead, was born about 70 years after the migration, and we read of his *grandson*, Zelophehad, whose daughters came to Moses for land, at the end of the wanderings, and who died in the wilderness, N.xxvii.1-3.

104. It is true that in 1Ch.vii.20-27 we have one remarkable exception to the above rule, where we find the genealogy of Joshua given as follows:—

'And the sons of Ephraim,—Shuthelah, and Bered his son, and Tahath his son, and Eladah his son, and Tahath his son, and Zabab his son, and Shuthelah his son, and Ezer, and Elend, whom the men of Gath, that were born in that land, slew, because they came down to take away their cattle. And Ephraim their father mourned many days, and his brethren came to comfort him. And when he went in unto his wife, she conceived and bare a son, and he called his name Beriah, because it went evil with his house. And his daughter was Sherah, who built Beth-horon the nether, and the upper, and Uzzeh-Sherah. And Rephah his son, and Resheph, and Telah his son, and Tahan his son, Laadan his son, Ammihud his son, Elishama his son, Nun his son, Jehoshuah his son.'

Here then, apparently, Joshua is given in the *ninth* generation from Ephraim, or the *tenth* from Joseph.

105. Upon this I would first remark as follows:—

(i) This is an exception to the rule, which prevails *universally* in the Pentateuch.

(ii) We are not here concerned with the books of Chronicles, (which, as all commentators will admit, were certainly composed *after the Captivity*,) but with the narrative in the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, and must abide by the data which they furnish.

(iii) The book of Chronicles itself exhibits the rule of the Pentateuch in all other cases, as in that of Moses and Aaron, vi.1-3, Korah,

vi.37,38, Achan, ii.4,6,7, Nahshon, ii.9,10, Bezaleel, ii.18,20, Jair, ii.21,22.

It is strange, then, that in this single instance of Joshua there should be so remarkable a variation from the general rule.

106. Let us now, however, examine more closely this statement in the book of Chronicles.

Since Joseph 'saw Ephraim's children of the third generation,' G.1.23, Telah, one of these, may have been born about seventy years after the migration into Egypt (103).

We have no express statement of the age of Joshua at the time of the Exodus. But we may suppose it to have been about the same as that of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, with whom he is so often coupled; and Caleb was forty years old, when sent to spy the land at the end of the first year after the Exodus, Jo.xiv.7. We may, therefore, adopt the estimate of JOSEPHUS, *Ant.V.i.29*, who reckons that the age of Joshua was *forty-five* at the time of the Exodus. This will agree well with the fact, that, shortly after leaving Egypt, while still young enough to be the 'minister' or servant of Moses, E.xxiv.13, he was old enough also to command the host of Israel when fighting with Amalek, E.xvii.9,10.

Hence, since the Exodus took place 215 years at most after the migration into Egypt, there must have intervened between the birth of Telah and that of Joshua 215-70-45, that is, 100 years; so that, according to the Chronicler, there must have been *six* complete generations in 100 years, which is hardly credible.

Again, according to the Chronicler, 'Elishama, the son of Ammihud,' was the grandfather of Joshua. But 'Elishama, the son of Ammihud,' was himself the captain of the host of Ephraim, N.ii.18, about a year after his *grandson*, Joshua, had commanded the whole Hebrew force which fought with Amalek, E.xvii.8-16, which also is hardly credible.

107. But in truth, the account of Joshua's descent in 1Ch.vii appears to be very perplexed and contradictory.

Thus, in v.24, we are told that Ephraim's *daughter* built three villages in the land of Canaan. If we suppose this to mean that the *descendants* of Ephraim's daughter, after the conquest in the time of Joshua, did this, yet in v.22,23, we have this strange fact stated, that Ephraim himself, after the slaughter by the men of Gath of his descendants in the *seventh* generation, 'mourned many days,' and,

then married again, and had a son, Beriah, who was the ancestor of Joshua!

KIRTO remarks upon this point, *Hist. of the Jews*, p. 146 :—

‘It is impossible that Ephraim should have been then alive to mourn over the seventh generation of his descendants. Read ‘Zabad’ for ‘Ephraim,’ and all becomes intelligible.’

This is, of course, mere conjecture, and it does not by any means dispose of the difficulty: for, by this correction, as a little consideration will show, Joshua will be made a descendant in the seventeenth generation from Joseph, to associate with Eleazar in the fourth generation from Levi.

BERTHEAU suggests that the whole passage in v. 20, ‘and Bered his son, and Tahath his son, and Eladah his son,’ may be *parenthetical*, carrying on the line of the first Shuthelah, so that, omitting this parenthesis, the words would run, ‘and the sons of Ephraim—Shuthelah, and Ezer, and Elead,’ &c., in which case Ezer and Elead, for whom Ephraim ‘mourned,’ would be the sons of Ephraim, elder brothers of Beriah, and younger brothers of the first Shuthelah, instead of the second. But why is not this important son of Ephraim, Beriah, the ancestor of so illustrious a person as Joshua, mentioned in the list of the sons of Ephraim which is given in the Pentateuch itself, N. xxvi. 35?

108. Upon the whole we are justified in dismissing this statement in the book of Chronicles, about the genealogy of Joshua, as in its present form uncertain or erroneous, and as being of no consequence at all in reference to the question before us, since it is found in a book written more than a thousand years after the time of the Exodus, and it stands alone even in that book, directly at variance with so many testimonies from the Pentateuch and from the book of Chronicles itself, all tending to a different conclusion.

109. We believe, then, that the story, as told in the Pentateuch, intends it to be understood—

(i) that the children of Israel came out of Egypt about 215 years after they went down thither in the time of Jacob,—

(ii) that they came out in the fourth generation from the adults in the prime of life, who went down with Jacob.

But the reader is requested to observe that the second of these conclusions does not in any way depend upon the correctness of the former.

And this is the view of JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* II. xv. 2 :—

They left Egypt four hundred and thirty years after our forefather Abraham came into

Canaan, but two hundred and fifteen years only after Jacob removed into Egypt.

And he says of Moses, *Ant.* II. ix. 6 :— Abraham was his ancestor of the seventh generation.

And of Joseph, *Against Apion*, i. 33 :— He died four generations before Moses, which four generations make almost 170 years.

So, too, Archd. PRATT observes, *Science and Scripture*, &c. p. 78 :—

It was to be in the fourth generation that his seed were to return to Canaan. But 430, or even 400, years is very much longer than four generations, and therefore must include something besides the bondage in Egypt, viz. the sojourning in Canaan. This prediction regarding the ‘fourth generation’ was literally fulfilled. Moses and Aaron were sons of Jochebed, who was the daughter of Levi, N. xxvi. 59, a text which incidentally confirms the correctness of our general outline. Eleazar, the Priest, the son of Aaron, was, therefore, of the fourth generation from Jacob.

110. From this it will appear that it is impossible that there should have been such a number of the people of Israel in Egypt, at the time of the Exodus, as to have furnished 600,000 warriors in the prime of life, representing, at least, two millions of persons, of all ages and sexes,—that is to say, it is impossible, *if we will take the data of the Pentateuch itself in their plain natural meaning*, and not force into them a meaning of our own.

CHAPTER XI.

THE NUMBER OF ISRAELITES AT THE TIME OF THE EXODUS.

111. In the first place, it must be observed, as already noted, that we nowhere read of any *very large families* among the children of Jacob or their descendants to the time of the Exodus. We may suppose, in order to have the population as large as possible, that very few died prematurely, and that those, who were born, almost all lived and multiplied. But we have no reason whatever, looking only at the data which are furnished by the Pentateuch itself, to assume that they had families materially larger than those of the present day. Thus we are told in G. xlii that Reuben had 4 sons, Simeon 6, Levi 3, Judah 5, Issachar 4, Zebulun 3, Gad 7, Asher 4, Joseph 2, Benjamin 10, Dan 1, Naphtali 4. And the list of families at the end of the Exodus,

as given in N.xxvi, so nearly agrees with the list of males in G.xlvi, as to prove that, according to the writer, if any more sons were *born* to the sons or grandsons of Jacob, after the descent into Egypt, (except in the case of Ephraim and Manasseh,) they did not *survive* or did not *fructify*, so as to be reckoned as heads of families.

112. The twelve sons of Jacob, then, as appears from the above, had between them 53 sons, that is, on the average, $4\frac{1}{2}$ each. Let us suppose that they increased in this way from generation to generation. Then in the *first* generation, that of *Kohath*, there would be 54 males, (according to the story, there were only 53, or, rather, 51, since Er and Onan died in the land of Canaan, v.12, without issue,)—in the *second*, that of *Amram*, 243,—in the *third*, that of *Moses* and *Aaron*, 1,094,—and in the *fourth*, that of *Joshua* and *Eleazar*, 4,923; that is to say, instead of 600,000 warriors in the prime of life, there could not have been 5,000.

113. Further, if the numbers of *all* the males in the four generations be added together, (which supposes that they were all living at the time of the Exodus,) they would only amount to 6,311. If we even add to these the number of the *fifth* generation, 22,154, who would be mostly children, the sum-total of males of all generations could not, according to these data, have exceeded 28,465, instead of being 1,000,000.

114. But in the above we have tacitly assumed that each man had daughters as well as sons. There must have been females born in the family of Jacob as well as males; and the females must have been as numerous as the males, if we are to suppose that all the males had families as above. 'Jacob's sons' wives,' it is true, are spoken of in G.xlvi.26, as *not* being out of his loins. But, with the story of Isaac's and Esau's and Jacob's marriages before us, we cannot suppose that the wives of the sons of Jacob, generally, were mere heathens. Judah, indeed, took a Canaanitish woman for his wife or concubine, G.xxxviii.2.

But we must not infer that all the other brothers did likewise, since we find it noted, as a special fact, that Simeon had, besides his other five sons, 'Shaul, the son of a Canaanitish woman,' G.xlvi.10. Joseph, again, compelled by the peculiarity of his situation, married an Egyptian lady, whom Pharaoh gave him to wife, G.xli.45. The other brothers, we may suppose, obtained their wives, as their fathers, Isaac and Jacob, did before them, from their relations in Haran.

115. But, however this may have been, we must suppose that in Egypt,—at all events, in their later days, for a hundred years or more, from the time that their afflictions began,—such friends were not accessible. We must conclude, then, that they either took as wives, generally, Egyptian heathen women, or else intermarried with one another. The former alternative is precluded by the whole tone and tenor of the narrative. As the object of the king was to keep down their numbers, it is not to be supposed that he would allow them to take wives freely from among his own people, or that the women of Egypt, (at least, those of the generation of Amram, which gave birth to Moses, and after it,) would be willing, generally, to associate their lot with a people so abject and oppressed as the Hebrews. Besides, we are told expressly that, in childbirth,—

'The Hebrew women were not as the Egyptian women,' E.i.19,—

By which it is plainly implied that the wives of the Hebrews were also Hebrews. The narrative itself, therefore, requires us to suppose that the Hebrew families intermarried, and that girls, as well as boys, were born to them freely in Egypt.

116. Yet we have no ground for supposing, from any data which we find in the narrative, that the whole number of the family was on that account increased. On the contrary, Zelophehad had *five* daughters, but *no* sons, N.xxvii.1; Amram had *two* sons and *one* daughter, N.xxvi.59; Moses had *two* sons and *no* daughter, E.xviii.3,4; Aaron had *four* sons and *no* daughter, N.xxvi.60; Izhar, Amram's brother, had

three sons, E.vi.21, Uzziel had three sons, E.vi.22, Korah had three sons, E.vi.24, Eleazar had one son, E.vi.25. In the last four cases we cannot say whether, or not, there were any daughters. But, if we take all the families given in E.vi.14-25, together with the two sons of Moses, we shall find that there are 13 persons, who have between them 39 sons, which gives an average of 3 sons each. This average is a fairer one to take for our purpose than the former; because these persons lived at all different times in the interval, between the migration into Egypt and the Exodus. We may suppose, also, that the average of children is still as large as before, or even larger, so that each man may have had on the average six children, three sons and three daughters.

117. Supposing, now, the 51 males (112) of the first generation (Kohath's) to have had each on the average three sons, and so on, we shall find the number of males in the second generation (Amram's) 153, in the third (Aaron's) 459, and in the fourth (Eleazar's) 1,377,—instead of 600,000.

In fact, in order that the 51 males of Kohath's generation might produce 600,000 fighting men in Eleazar's, we must suppose that each man had 46 children (23 of each sex), and each of these 23 sons had 46 children, and so on!—of which prolific increase, it need hardly be said, there is not the slightest indication in the Bible, except, indeed, in the statement of the number of the first-borns, which has been already considered.

118. Bishop PATRICK suggests, (note on E.i.7,) that the Hebrew women might, by 'extraordinary blessing of God,' have brought forth 'six children at a time'! It is plain that he felt very strongly the difficulty raised by the Scripture statement, and did not consider how this fecundity would affect the Hebrew women, as regards either the birth, or the rearing, of the children.

But the Scripture implies no such fecundity among the Hebrews, either in G.xlvi, or in E.vi, or in E.i.19, where the midwives say of the Hebrew

women, 'they are delivered ere the midwives come in unto them,'—which could hardly have been said, if three or more children were often born at a time.

119. In 1Ch.ii.34,35, we read that Sheshan, a descendant of Judah in the ninth generation,—

'had a servant, an Egyptian, whose name was Jarha; and Sheshan gave his daughter to Jarha his servant to wife, and she bare him Attai,'—

whose descendants are then traced down through twelve generations, and are reckoned, apparently, as Israelites of the tribe of Judah. From this it would seem that Hebrew girls might be married to foreigners,—we may suppose, proselytes,—and their children would then be reckoned as 'children of Israel.' It is obvious that such cases would be comparatively rare. But let us suppose that each man had six children as in (116), three sons and three daughters, and that even half the daughters of Israel were married to foreign proselytes,—a most extravagant supposition. This would be equivalent to reckoning that each man had on the average—not 3 sons, but—4½, as in (112). And the total number of warriors in the fourth generation, resulting from 51 progenitors, would, as before, not amount to 5,000.

120. When, however, we go on further to examine into the details of this large number of male adults, the results will be found yet more extraordinary.

Thus Dan in the first generation has one son, Hushim, G.xlvi.23; and, that he had no more born to him in the land of Egypt, and, therefore, had only one son, appears from N.xxvi.42, where the sons of Dan consist of only one family. Hence we may reckon that in the fourth generation he would have had 27 warriors descended from him, instead of 62,700, as stated in N.ii.26, which number is increased to 64,400 in N.xxvi.43.

121. In order to have had this number born to him, we must suppose that Dan's one son, and each of his sons and grandsons, must have had about 80 children of both sexes.

We may observe also that the offspring of the *one* son of Dan, 62,700, is represented as nearly double that of the *ten* sons of Benjamin, 35,400, N.ii.23.

122. Again we have in E.vi the genealogy, before quoted, of the three sons of Levi, who came with Jacob into Egypt,—Gershon, Kohath, Merari.

(i) These three increased in the *second* (Amram's) generation only to 8, (not to 9, as it would have been, on our supposition, that they had had each three sons on the average,) viz. the sons of *Kohath* 4, of *Gershon* 2, of *Merari* 2, E.vi.17-19.

(ii) The 4 sons of *Kohath* increased in the *third* (Aaron's) generation only to 8, (not to 12, as on our supposition,) viz. the sons of Amram (Moses and Aaron) 2, of Izhar 3, of Uzziel 3, E.vi.20-22. If we now assume that the two sons of *Gershon* and the two sons of *Merari* increased in the same proportion, that is, to 4 and 4 respectively, then all the male Levites of the *third* generation would have been 16.

(iii) The two sons of Amram increased in the *fourth* (Eleazar's) generation to 6, viz. the sons of Aaron 4, (of whom, however, 2 died, N.iii.2,4,) and of Moses 2. Assuming that all the 16 of the third generation increased in the same proportion, then all the male Levites of the generation of Eleazar would have been 48, or rather 44, if we omit the 4 sons of Aaron, who were reckoned as Priests. Thus the whole number of Levites, who would be numbered at the first census, would be only 44, viz. 20 *Kohathites*, 12 *Gershonites*, 12 *Merarites*; whereas in N.iv.48 they are numbered as 8,580, viz. 2,750 *Kohathites*, 2,630 *Gershonites*, and 3,200 *Merarites*.

123. Or we may put the matter in another, and a yet stronger, light, *using only the express data of Scripture*, and omitting all reference to the 215 years' sojourn in Egypt and to the four generations,—in fact, *making no assumptions of our own whatever*.

The Amramites, numbered as Levites in the fourth (Eleazar's) generation, were, as above, only two, viz. the

two sons of Moses, the sons of Aaron being reckoned as Priests. Hence the rest of the Kohathites of this generation must have been made up of the descendants of Izhar and Uzziel, each of whom had *three* sons, E.vi.21,22. Consequently, since *all* the Kohathites of Eleazar's generation were numbered at 2,750, N.iv.36, it follows that these *six* men must have had between them, according to the Scripture story, 2,748 sons, and we must suppose about the same number of daughters!

124. It must now, surely, be sufficiently plain that the account of these numbers is of no statistical value whatever.

But then what are we to say of the whole story of the Exodus,—of the camping and marching of the Israelites,—of their fighting with Amalek and Midian,—of the 44 Levites (122) slaying 3,000 of the 'children of Israel,' E.xxxii.28,—of the people dying by pestilence, 14,700 at one time, N.xvi.49, 24,000 at another, N.xxv.9,—as well as of the whole body of 600,000 fighting men being swept away during the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness? Several chapters of the book of Numbers are occupied in laying down the duties of the Levites,—not of the Levites, as they were to be in after years, when their numbers might be multiplied, but as they were to be then, in the wilderness, in attendance upon the Tabernacle. How were the 20 Kohathites, the 12 Gershonites, and the 12 Merarites, to discharge the offices assigned to them in N.iii.iv, in carrying the Tabernacle and its vessels,—to do, in short, the work of 8580 men, N.iv.48? What were these forty-four people, with the two Priests, and their families, to do with the forty-eight cities assigned to them, N.xxxv.7? How could the Tabernacle itself have been erected, when the silver spent upon it was contributed, as we are expressly told, by a poll-tax of half a shekel, E.xxxviii.26, levied upon the whole body of 603,550 warriors, who did not exist?

125. In fact, the consequences of admitting the reality of the above results

are obviously so important, that, of course, the most strenuous efforts have been made to 'reconcile' these discrepancies, if possible, by those theologians, who support the traditionary view, and who have studied the Pentateuch sufficiently to be aware of the difficulties thus raised. The nature of the attempt will be best seen, by stating the contrivances resorted to for this purpose, to the sacrifice of historical truth and consistency.

126. Thus says KURTZ, ii.149,—

It is a gross mistake to suppose that the two millions were all the direct descendants of Jacob. When Jacob and his sons went down to Egypt, they must certainly have taken with them all their menservants and maid-servants, as well as all their cattle. We know that Abraham had 318 servants, fit for war, and trained to arms: his nomadic household must have contained, therefore, more than a thousand souls. Jacob, again, who inherited all these, brought with him from Syria so many menservants and maidservants, and so much cattle, that, when he was afraid of an attack from Esau, he divided them into two armies. With such data as these, then, we are justified in assuming that the number of those, who went down with Jacob into Egypt, was not limited to his sixty-six children and grand-children, but consisted of several thousand menservants and maidservants. But, according to G.xvii.12,13, these had all been circumcised; and in Egypt the descendants of Jacob will, no doubt, have married the descendants of his servants. Hence we regard the two million souls, who left Egypt at the Exodus, as the posterity of *the whole of the people*, who went down into Egypt with Jacob.

127. We might reply as follows:—

(i) There is no indication of any such a cortège having accompanied Jacob into Egypt.

(ii) There is no sign even in G.xxxii.xxxiii, where Jacob meets with Esau, of his having any such a large body of servants. Twenty or thirty would suffice for all the wants of the story.

(iii) If he had had so many at his command, can we suppose that he would have sent his darling Joseph, without a single attendant, to wander about in search of his brethren, in a country where not only human foes, G.xxxiv.30, but *wild beasts*, G.xxxvii.20,33, were to be dreaded?

(iv) These also are spoken of as 'feeding their flocks,' and seem to have had none of these 'thousands' of servants with them, to witness their brother's arrival, and their ill-treatment of him, and report it to their father.

(v) Nothing is said about any of these servants coming down with the sons of Jacob to buy corn in Egypt, on either of their expeditions. Rather, the whole story implies the contrary,—they speedily took down every man his sack to the ground, and opened every man his sack,—then they rent their clothes, and laden every man his ass, and returned to the city,—we are brought in, that he may

seek occasion against us, and take us for bondmen and our asses,' not a word being said about servants.

(vi) In fact, *their eleven sacks would have held but a very scanty supply of food for the relief of so many starving thousands.*

(vii) If Jacob had so many 'servants,' and not only 'flocks' and 'herds,' G.xlvii.1, but 'camels' and 'asses,' G.xxxii.15, it is strange that he did not send some of these servants with additional camels and asses, instead of sending merely his sons with their asses, to bring food for his people. If it be said, the corn was only needed for the use of Jacob and his sons, not for the thousands of servants, who might live upon such coarse and scanty food as the land of Canaan still supplied, yet the language used on each occasion, 'that we may live and not die,' G.xlii.2, xliii.8, and the fact that Jacob parted at last with Benjamin, imply that the corn was a *necessary* for them, and therefore also for their servants, and not merely a superfluity.

128. But, besides all this, it is evident that the whole stress of the story is laid upon this very point, that the multitude,—the *males*, at all events,—who went up out of Egypt at the Exodus, had come out of the loins of Jacob, and increased from the 'seventy souls,' who went down at first.

'Thy fathers went down with threescore and ten persons; and now the LORD thy God hath made thee as the stars of heaven for multitude.' D.x.22.

Could this have been written, if, besides the 'threescore and ten' out of Jacob's loins, there went down with him some thousands, or even hundreds, of servants, whose offspring constituted the great bulk of the future people,—in fact, more than 600,000 of the warriors, since the Israelites proper (117) numbered less than 2,000?

If, then, we supposed that *all* the women were obtained from strangers, it is certain that the Pentateuch represents the 600,000 fighting men as Jacob's actual descendants, and 62,700 of these as the offspring of Dan at the time of the Exodus. And we have the same difficulty as before, to explain how this could have happened in 215 years and four generations.

129. But, says KURTZ, ii.p.133, for 215 years, we must reckon 430 years, and 'four generations' must mean '*four centuries*.' Even then, he admits the increase would be 'unparalleled in history.' Even then also there would remain other insuperable difficulties, as, for instance, that connected with

the question of the first-born (90), namely, that every Hebrew mother must have had, on the average, more than forty children.

But here the genealogies of Moses and Aaron, and the others quoted in (103), come in the way, and show distinctly what is meant by the 'fourth generation.' And the ages of Kohath and Amram are both given, so as to make it impossible, as we have seen (97), to extend the sojourn in Egypt to 430 years.

130. Then, KURTZ suggests, in the pedigree of Moses and Aaron there must be some names omitted.

The four members which commonly appear, Levi, Kohath, Amram, Moses, are intended merely to represent the four generations, who dwelt in Egypt. ii.141.

But, as the pedigree of Moses and Aaron is repeated again and again, in a very precise and formal manner, without the least intimation being given that it is meant to be less historically true than any of the other genealogies, we must accept it as it stands. And, indeed, it would be strange, that we should have accurate genealogies given us for a number of persons of very second-rate importance in the story, and none at all for Moses and Aaron. And, even if we supposed that some names may have been omitted in this particular genealogy, how is it that so many other genealogies, as quoted in (103), contain only the same number of names? Besides, it is expressly stated, as a matter of *bonâ fide* domestic history, (as much so as that of Abraham marrying Sarah, or Isaac, Rebecca, or Jacob, Leah and Rachel,) that Amram married 'Jochebed his father's sister,' Evi.20, 'the daughter of Levi, whom (his wife) bare to Levi in Egypt,' N.xxvi.59.

131. But then, says KURTZ, the word here rendered 'father's sister' may only mean 'blood-relative on the father's side.' And there is *one* instance in the Scripture (Jer.xxxii.12 compared with v.7) where the Hebrew word seems to be used in this sense, though the other is the common and proper one.

Jochebed, then, may be called a 'daughter of Levi' in the same sense in which Christ is called a 'son of David.' And this very phrase itself, 'whom (his wife) bare to Levi in Egypt,'

has the appearance of a gloss appended to the preceding words 'daughter of Levi,' which the author of the gloss seems to have understood in their literal sense, as denoting an actual daughter of Levi, and then to have endeavoured to soften down the improbability of Moses' mother being a daughter of Levi, [as no daughter of Levi is mentioned in G. xlv.] by appending a clause to the effect that the daughter in question was born in Egypt. This gloss, we admit, must have been introduced at a very early period, as it is found in every codex and version. ii.141.

But, even if these words are a gloss, and Jochebed was not an actual daughter of Levi, (which, however, is a mere conjecture of the above commentator,) the main fact would remain the same, viz. that the pedigree of Moses and Aaron is undoubtedly meant to be understood as a *bonâ fide* pedigree. And, as we have seen, it brings with it, as a necessary consequence, a number of absolute impossibilities,—among others, that six men must have had between them 2,748 sons (123).

132. Accordingly we find KURTZ himself almost driven to despair in his attempts to get over this difficulty.

Are we to believe, then, that Kohath's descendants through Amram consisted of no more than 6 males at the time of the census recorded in N.iii. (viz. Moses and his two sons, Aaron and his two sons,) whilst his descendants through the other three sons, Izhar, Hebron, and Uzziel, consisted at the very same period of 8,656 males [? 8,594, N.iii.28] at the very same time, that is, 2,885 for each? This, certainly, is a *large* demand upon our faith. Still, as we cannot say that it is impossible, we submit and believe. But we are further required to believe, N.iii.27, that at this census the 6 Amramites—what am I saying? there could really have been only *two* included in the census, namely, the two sons of Moses; for Aaron and his sons were Priests, to whom the Levites were to be assigned as a present; and, as it was for this very purpose that the census was taken, they would certainly not be included in it, any more than Moses himself:—hence, then, we are required to believe that the *two* remaining Amramites formed a distinct family, with precisely the same privileges and duties, as the 2,885 Izharites, the 2,885 Hebronites, and the 2,885 Uzzielites. We must candidly confess that our faith will not reach so far as this. ii.144.

CHAPTER XII.

THE NUMBER OF PRIESTS AT THE EXODUS.

133. THE book of Leviticus is chiefly occupied in giving directions to the Priests for the proper discharge of the different duties of their office, and

further directions are given in the book of Numbers.

(i) In the case of 'every burnt-offering, which any man shall offer,' whether bullock, or sheep, or goat, or turtle-dove, 'the *Priests, Aaron's sons*, shall sprinkle the blood upon the altar, and put fire upon the altar, and lay the wood in order on the fire, and lay the parts, the head and the fat, in order upon the wood'; and 'the *Priest* shall burn all on the altar, to be a burnt-sacrifice.' L.i.

(ii) So in the case of a *meat-offering*, L.ii, *peace-offering*, L.iii, *sin-offering*, L.iv, or *trespass-offering*, L.v,vi, the *Priest* has special duties assigned to him as before.

(iii) Every woman after childbirth is to bring a lamb for a burnt-offering, and a pigeon or turtle-dove for a sin-offering, or two young pigeons for the two offerings, and the *Priest* is to officiate, as before, L.xii.

(iv) Every case of leprosy is to be brought again and again to the *Priest*, and carefully inspected by him till it is cured, L.xiii.

(v) Any one, cured of leprosy, is to bring a burnt-offering and a sin-offering, and the *Priest* is to officiate, as before, L.xiv.

(vi) For certain ceremonial pollutions, which are specified, the *Priest* is to offer sacrifice, L.xv.15,30.

(vii) For a male or female Nazarite, when the days of separation are fulfilled, the *Priest* is to offer a burnt-offering, a sin-offering, and a peace-offering, N.vi.

(viii) Every day, morning and evening, the *Priest* is to offer a lamb for a continual burnt-offering, besides additional sacrifices on the Sabbath, the New Moon, at the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and at the Feast of the First-fruits, N.xviii.

(ix) Lastly, if it should be thought that the above sacrificial system was not meant, generally, to be in full operation in the wilderness, we may call attention to the frequent references made, in the enunciation of these laws, to the *Camp*, L.iv.12,21,vi.11,xiii.46,xiv.3,8, as well as to the words of the prophet Amos v.25,—'Have ye offered unto Me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness, forty years, O House of Israel?'—which show that, in the prophet's view, at all events, such sacrifices were required and expected of them. And, indeed, why was the Tabernacle, with the Brazen Altar, erected in the wilderness at all, or why were the *Priests* consecrated, if the laws of sacrifice were not meant to be carried out generally, at once, in the wilderness?

134. And now let us ask, for all these multifarious duties, during the forty years' sojourn in the wilderness,—for all the burnt-offerings, meat-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, thank-offerings, &c., of a population like that of the city of London, besides the daily and extraordinary sacrifices,—how many *Priests* were there?

The answer is very simple. There were only *three*,—Aaron, (till his

death,) and his two sons, Eleazar and Ithamar. And it is laid down very solemnly in N.iii.10,—

'Thou shalt appoint Aaron and his sons, and they shall wait in the *Priest's* office; and the stranger, that cometh nigh, shall be put to death.'

135. Yet how was it possible that these two or three men should have discharged all these duties for such a vast multitude? The single work, of offering the double sacrifice for women after child-birth, must have utterly overpowered three *Priests*, though engaged without cessation from morning to night. As we have seen (64), the births among two millions of people may be reckoned as, at least, 250 a day, for which, consequently, 500 sacrifices (250 burnt-offerings and 250 sin-offerings) would have had to be offered daily. Looking at the directions in L.i,ix, we can scarcely allow less than *five minutes* for each sacrifice; so that these sacrifices alone, if offered separately, would have taken 2,500 minutes or nearly 42 hours, and could not have been offered in a single day of twelve hours, though each of the three *Priests* had been employed in the one sole incessant labour of offering them, without a moment's rest or intermission.

136. It may, perhaps, be said that *many* such sacrifices might have been offered at the same time. This is, surely, somewhat contrary to the notion of a sacrifice, as derived from the book of Leviticus; nor is there the slightest intimation, in the whole Pentateuch, of any such heaping together of sacrifices; and it must be borne in mind that there was but *one* altar, five cubits (about 9 feet) square, E.xxvii.1, at which we have already supposed all the three *Priests* to be officiating at the same moment, actually offering, therefore, upon the altar *three* sacrifices at once, of which the *burnt-offerings* would, except in the case of poor women, L.xii.8, be *lambs*, and not pigeons.

137. But then we must ask further, where could they have obtained these 250 'turtle-doves or young pigeons' daily, that is 90,000 annually, in the wilderness? There *might* be two offered for each birth; there *must*, according

to the Law, be *one*, L.xii.6,8. Did the people, then, carry with them *turtle-doves* and *young pigeons* out of Egypt, when they fled in such haste, and so heavily laden, and as yet knew nothing of any such law? Or how could they have had them at all under Sinai?

138. It cannot be said that the particular laws, which require the sacrifice of such birds, were intended only to suit the circumstances of a later time, when the people should be finally settled in the land of Canaan. For we have one of these very laws, in which manifest reference is made to their life in the wilderness, L.xiii.xiv. In this passage after it has been ordered that the leper 'shall dwell alone, without the *Camp*,' xiii.46, and that 'the Priest shall go forth out of the *Camp* to look at the leper,' xiv.3, and that the leper duly cleansed shall 'after that come into the *Camp*, and shall tarry abroad out of his *tent* seven days,' v.8, and on the eighth day shall offer 'two he-lambs and one ewe-lamb,' &c. v.10, it is added, v.21,—

'And, if he be *poor*, and cannot get so much, then he shall take one lamb, &c., and *two turtle-doves* or *two young pigeons*, such as he is able to get.'

139. Here, then, the 'turtle-doves' or 'young pigeons' are prescribed as a lighter and easier offering for the poor to bring. They are spoken of, therefore, as being so common, as to be within the reach of the poorest,—as being *in abundance*, so as to be offered at the rate of 90,000 a year,—in the wilderness, under Sinai! But can any one believe that pigeons or turtle-doves, even if found on the rocks of Sinai at all, are found there in such numbers, as to make a pair of them a cheap offering for a poor man? It would seem, then, to follow that such laws as these could not have been written by Moses,—much less have been laid down by Jehovah Himself,—but must have been composed at a later age,—as, for instance, in the days of David or Solomon, or afterwards,—when the people were already settled in Canaan, and the poor, who could not afford a lamb, could easily provide themselves with pigeons.

140. Again we have in N.xviii.9-11

the following commands, addressed to Aaron by Jehovah Himself.

'Every oblation of theirs, every meat-offering of theirs, and every sin-offering of theirs, and every trespass-offering of theirs, which they shall render unto Me, shall be most holy for thee and for thy sons. *In the most holy place shalt thou eat it; every male shall eat it; it shall be holy unto thee.*

'This also is thine, the heave-offering of their gift, with all the wave-offerings of the children of Israel. I have given them unto thee, and to thy sons, and to thy daughters with thee, by a statute for ever; every one that is clean in thy house shall eat of it.'

Then follow other directions, by which it is provided that the Priest should have also 'the best of the oil, and all the best of the wine, and of the wheat, the first-fruits of them, which they shall offer unto Jehovah,' and 'whatsoever is first ripe in the land;' which laws we may suppose were intended only to be applied, when the people had become settled on their farms in the land of Canaan, as also the law, v.25-29, for their receiving also a tenth of the tithes of corn and wine and oil, which were to be given for the support of the Levites.

141. But in v.14-18 we have again these provisions:—

'Every thing devoted in Israel shall be thine. Every thing that openeth the matrix in all flesh, which they bring unto Jehovah, whether it be of men or beasts, shall be thine: nevertheless, the first-born of man shalt thou surely redeem, and the firstling of unclean beasts shalt thou redeem.

'But the firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy; thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto Jehovah.

'And the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave-breast and as the right shoulder are thine.'

Similar directions are also laid down in L.vii:—

'As the sin-offering is, so is the trespass-offering; there is one law for them: the Priest, that maketh atonement therewith, shall have it. And the Priest, which offereth any man's burnt-offering, even the Priest shall have to himself the skin of the burnt-offering which he hath offered. And all the meat-offering that is baked in the oven, and all that is dressed in the frying-pan and in the pan, shall be the Priest's that offereth it. And every meat-offering, mingled with oil, and dry, shall all the sons of Aaron have, one as much as another.' v.7-10.

'For the wave-breast and the heave-shoulder have I taken of the children of Israel from off the sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the Priest and unto

his sons, by a statute for ever, from among the children of Israel.' v.34.

142. These last directions are given in the story before Aaron and his sons were consecrated. Hence they must be considered as intended to apply to them, while the Camp was in the wilderness, as well as to the 'sons of Aaron' in future generations. But what an enormous provision was this for Aaron and his four, afterwards two, sons and their families! They were to have the skins of the *burnt-offerings*, and the shoulder and breast (that is, double-breast) of the *peace-offerings*, of a congregation of two millions of people, for the general use of their three families! But, besides these, they were to have the whole of the *sin-offerings*, and *trespass-offerings*, except the suet, which was to be burnt upon the Altar, L.iv.31,35,v.6; and the whole of the *meat-offerings*, except a handful, to be burnt as a memorial, L.ii.2; and all this was to be eaten *only by the three males, in the most holy place*, N.xviii.10!

143. And it would seem that they were not at liberty to *burn* the sin-offerings, or consume them in some other way than by eating: they must be 'eaten in the holy place.' At all events, we find it recorded that, on one occasion,—

'Moses diligently sought the goat of the sin-offering, and, behold, it was burnt! and he was angry with Eleazar and Ithamar, the sons of Aaron, saying, Wherefore have ye not eaten the sin-offering in the holy place, seeing it is most holy, and God hath given it you to bear the iniquity of the Congregation, to make atonement for them before Jehovah? Ye should indeed have eaten it in the holy place, as I commanded.' L.x.16-20.

The very pigeons, to be brought as *sin-offerings* for the birth of children, would have averaged, according to the story, more than 250 a day; and each Priest would have had to eat daily more than 80, for his own portion, 'in the most holy place'!

Can it be believed that such a system was really laid down by Jehovah Himself, which, if properly carried out by pious Israelites according to the Divine Command, would have involved immediately absurd impossibilities like the above, and required instant modification?

144. HENGSTENBERG, in fact, *Pent.* ii.p.60, recognises, unawares, the force of the above argument, when he insists upon there having been a multitude of Priests in attendance on the Tabernacle in *Eli's* time, besides Eli himself and his two sons, Hophni and Phinehas.

Let it be considered that an extensive supply of Priests and sacrifices was required by the great reverence, in which, according to 1S. iv-vii, the Ark of the Covenant was held at this period. In the address of the man of God to Eli, 1S.ii.28, it is represented as the prerogative of the Priesthood to place the sacrifices on the Altar, to burn incense, and to receive all the offerings made by fire of the children of Israel. An order, possessed of such prerogatives, must have been held in high esteem, and must have contained a considerable number of members. *For what could one or two isolated Priests do with the sacrifices of all Israel?*

And again he writes, ii.52:—

Since *all* Israel at that time offered their sacrifices at the Sanctuary in Shiloh, how was it possible for two or three Priests to perform the requisite service?

145. HENGSTENBERG does not appear to see how strongly this argument bears against the historical veracity of the Pentateuch itself. For, if it was impossible for two or three Priests to suffice at Shiloh, for the Israelites who lived scattered about the land of Canaan, and who, therefore, could not possibly have *all* come continually to offer sacrifice, how was it possible for Aaron and his two sons to have 'performed the requisite service' for the whole assembled host in the wilderness?

146. Further, in Jo.xxi we have an account of the forty-eight Levitical cities; and we read v.19,—

'All the cities of the children of Aaron, the Priests, were thirteen cities, with their suburbs.'

At this time, according to the story, there was certainly *one* son of Aaron, Eleazar, and one grandson, Phinehas, and his family. Ithamar, Aaron's other son, *may* have been alive; but no mention whatever is made of him. We may suppose, however, that he had sons and daughters. For this small number of persons, then, there are provided here *thirteen* cities and their suburbs, and all, let it be ob-

served, in the immediate neighbourhood of Jerusalem, where the Temple was built, and where the presence of the Priests was especially required, but in a later age.

147. The Rev. T. SCOTT notes as follows:—

The family of Aaron could not at this time have been very numerous (!), though it had increased considerably (!) since his appointment to the Priesthood. Yet thirteen cities were allotted to it as a patrimony, in the divine knowledge of its future enlargement. For we have reason to think that no other family increased so much in proportion, after Israel's departure from Egypt, as that of Aaron.

The only conceivable 'reason' for so 'thinking' is the fact now before us, viz. that thirteen cities were assigned to them. We do not find the sons of Aaron numerous in the time of the Judges, or in Eli's time, or Samuel's or David's, or Solomon's (except, indeed, in the record of the Chronicler). Aaron himself had at most only two sons living and one of these had only one son.

148. Once more, how did these three Priests manage at the celebration of the Passover?

We are told, 2Ch.xxx.16, xxxv.11, that the people killed the Passover, but,—

'The Priests sprinkled the blood from their hands, and the Levites slayed them.'

Hence, when they kept the second passover under Sinai, N.ix.5, where we must suppose that 150,000 lambs (59) were killed at one time 'between the two evenings,' E.xii.6, for the two millions of people,—at which time, certainly, there were only three Priests, Aaron, Eleazar, and Ithamar, L.viii.2, N.iii.4, each Priest must have had to sprinkle the blood of 50,000 lambs in about two * hours, that is, at the rate

of about four hundred lambs every minute for two hours together!

149. Dr. McCaul has supposed, *Examination*, &c. p.137-9, that one lamb or kid may have sufficed for a hundred persons or more, and also that only the adult males kept the Passover, &c.; and he has thus reduced the number of lambs required to 8,000. Yet even this would have made it necessary that each of the three Priests should sprinkle the blood of more than twenty-two lambs a minute for two hours, without a moment's intermission.

150. Dr. McCaul again says, *Examination*, &c. p.141, that the phrase 'between the two evenings' means 'soon after noon until six o'clock, at least 5½ hours.' Be it so: let us allow six hours, and suppose with Dr. McCaul that only the 'adult males' ate the Passover, and that one lamb sufficed for a hundred persons. Then, at this second Passover, three Priests, with 8,000 lambs to be killed in six hours, would still have had to sprinkle the blood of about eight a minute, for six hours (!) together, without a moment's intermission,—quite as impossible a performance, surely, as the former.

151. Further, in the time of Hezekiah and Josiah, when it was desired to keep the Passover very strictly, 'in such sort as it was written,' 2Ch.xxx.5, the lambs were manifestly killed in the Court of the Temple. We must suppose, then, that the Paschal lambs in the wilderness were killed in the Court of the Tabernacle,—in accordance, in fact, with the strict injunctions of the Levitical Law, that all burnt-offerings, peace-offerings, sin-offerings, and trespass-offerings, should be killed 'before Jehovah,' at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation.

152. Thus we read in the case of a burnt-offering, L.i.3,5,—

'He shall offer it of his own voluntary will at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation. And he shall kill the bullock before Jehovah; and the Priests, Aaron's sons, shall

cannot, therefore, have been more than two hours, as we have reckoned it. And so writes JOSEPHUS (*Jewish War*, VI.ix.3), 'They slay their sacrifices at the Passover from the ninth hour to the eleventh.'

* KURTZ allows, II.801, that the Caraites and Samaritans are right in explaining the expression 'between the two evenings' to mean 'the period between the disappearance of the sun below the horizon and the time when it is quite dark, that is, from six o'clock till about half-past seven. Thus the first evening begins with the disappearance of the sun, the second with the cessation of daylight. ABEN-EZRA gives the same explanation.'

Hence the time allowed for the killing of the Passover was, in fact, the time of twilight, and

bring the blood, and sprinkle the blood round about upon the Altar, that is by the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation.'

So in that of a peace-offering, L.iii.2,—

'He shall lay his hand upon the head of his offering, and kill it at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation; and Aaron's sons, the Priests, shall sprinkle the blood upon the Altar round about.' See L.i.3,5,11,15, iii.2,8, 13,iv.4,6,&c.

Besides all which, we have this most solemn command, laid down in L.xvii. 2-6, with the penalty of death attached for disobedience.

'This is the thing which Jehovah hath commanded, saying, What man soever there be of the House of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat, in the Camp, or that killeth it out of the Camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, to offer an offering unto Jehovah, blood shall be imputed unto that man, he hath shed blood, and that man shall be cut off from among his people; to the end that the children of Israel may bring their sacrifices, which they offer in the open field, even that they may bring them unto Jehovah, unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, unto the Priest, and offer them for peace-offerings unto Jehovah. And the Priest shall sprinkle the blood upon the Altar of Jehovah, at the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, and burn the fat (suet) for a sweet savour unto Jehovah.'

153. How, in fact, could the Priests have sprinkled the blood at all, if this were not the case, that the animals were killed in the Court of the Tabernacle?

But the area of the Court contained, as we have seen (30), only 1,692 square yards, and could only have held, when thronged to the uttermost, about 5,000 people. How then are we to conceive of 150,000 lambs being killed within it, by, at least, 150,000 people, in the space of two hours,—that is, *at the rate of 1,250 lambs a minute*? Or, taking even Dr. McCaul's estimate, how can we believe that *within one-third of an acre of ground* more than a thousand lambs an hour were killed for six hours together?

154. The only way, in short, of getting over the difficulties of the case is to say, with Dr. McCaul, *Examination*, &c. p.143-6, that the blood of the lambs was *not* sprinkled by the Priests at the Passover.

The Passover is neither a burnt-offering, nor a peace-offering, nor a sin-offering, nor a trespass-offering: it is an offering *per se*, and therefore these strict injunctions do not apply to it.

Yet the Chronicler says, speaking of the Passover kept in the days of Josiah, 2Ch.xxx.16,—

'They stood in their place, after their manner, according to the Law of Moses, the man of God: the Priests sprinkled the blood from the hand of the Levites.'

Either, therefore, this statement of the Chronicler is *not* true,—and in that case the main question at issue is given up, as to the *infallibility* of the book of Chronicles, and, therefore, of the Bible generally,—or it must be admitted that the Priests *did* sprinkle the blood at the Passover, 'according to the law of Moses,'—that is, according to the whole *spirit* of that Law, and according to the *express command*, as quoted above from L.xvii.2-6, that *all* sacrifices of *every kind*—nay, that all animals killed for common food,—should be killed at the entrance of the Tabernacle, and their blood sprinkled or poured out by the Priests. Is it to be believed that the Passover was to be the only exception in this respect, and this directly in the teeth of the whole spirit of the Law, of its express directions, and of the Chronicler's plain statement?

CHAPTER XIII.

THE WAR ON MIDIAN.

155. FROM the above considerations it seems to follow, that the account of the Exodus of the Israelites, as given in the Pentateuch, whatever real foundation it may have had in the ancient history of the people, is mixed up, at all events, with so great an amount of contradictory matter, that it cannot be regarded as historically true, so as to be appealed to, as absolute, incontestable matter of fact. For the objections, which have been produced, are not such as touch only one or two points of the story. They affect the entire substance of it; and, until they are removed, they make it impossible for a thoughtful person to receive, without further enquiry, any considerable portion of it, as *certainly true* in an historical point of view.

156. We cannot here have recourse to the ordinary supposition, that there may be something wrong in the *Hebrew*

numerals. First, the number '600,000 on foot, that were male beside children,' is given distinctly in E.xii.37, at the time of their leaving Egypt; then we have it recorded again, as we have said, *thrice over, in different forms*, in E.xxxviii. 25-28, at the beginning of the forty years' wanderings, when the number of all that 'went to be numbered, from twenty years old and upward,' is reckoned at 603,550; and this is repeated again in N.i.46; and it is modified once more, at the end of the wanderings, to 601,730, N.xxvi.51. Besides which, on each occasion of numbering, each separate tribe is numbered, and the sum of the separate results makes up the whole.

156. Thus this number is woven, as a kind of thread, into the whole story of the Exodus, and cannot be taken out, without tearing the whole fabric to pieces. It affects, directly, the account of the construction of the Tabernacle, E.xxxviii.25-28, and, therefore, also the account of the institutions, whether of the Priesthood or of Sacrifice, connected with it. And the multiplied impossibilities introduced by this number alone, independently of all other considerations, are enough to throw discredit upon the historical character of the general narrative.

157. These things we have all along been looking at, as it were, from a distant point of view, through a misty atmosphere, dreading, it may be, some of us, to approach and gaze more closely upon the truth itself, which, once clearly seen, must dissipate some of our most cherished convictions, and hardly daring, indeed, to engage in (what many would consider) an irreverent and impious undertaking. To those of my readers, however, who have followed me thus far, I hope it will now be apparent that there is no longer any cause for superstitious terror, in respect of the enquiries which we are making. Rather, it is our duty, as servants of God, the very God of Truth, and in dependence on His help and blessing, to pursue them yet farther, whatever the result may be,—fearing no evil, for what shall harm us, if we are followers of that which is right, and good, and true?

158. But how thankful we must be, that we are no longer obliged to believe, as a matter of fact, of vital consequence to our eternal hope, each separate statement contained in the Pentateuch, such, for instance, as the story related in N.xxxi!—where we are told that a force of 12,000 Israelites slew all the males of the Midianites, took captive *all* the females and children, seized *all* their cattle and flocks, (72,000 oxen, 61,000 asses, 675,000 sheep), and *all* their goods, and 'burnt *all* their cities, and *all* their goodly castles,' without the loss of a single man,—and then, by command of Moses, butchered in cold blood all the women and children, except—

'All the women-children, who have not known a man by lying with him,' v.18.

159. These last they were to 'keep alive for themselves.' They amounted, to 32,000, v.35, mostly, we must suppose, under the age of sixteen or eighteen. We may fairly reckon that there were as many more under the age of forty, and half as many more above forty, making altogether 80,000 females, of whom, according to the story, Moses ordered 48,000 to be killed, besides (say) 20,000 young boys. The tragedy of Cawnpore, where 300 were butchered, would sink into nothing, compared with such a massacre, if, indeed, we were required to believe it. And these 48,000 females must have represented 48,000 men, all of whom, in that case, we must also believe to have been killed, their property pillaged, their castles demolished, and towns destroyed, by 12,000 Israelites, who, in addition, must have carried off 100,000 captives, (more than eight persons to each man,) and driven before them 808,000 head of cattle, (more than sixty-seven for each man,) and all without the loss of a single man! How is it possible to quote the Bible as in any way condemning slavery, when we read here, v.40, of 'Jehovah's tribute' of slaves, thirty-two persons, who were given to Eleazar the Priest, while three-hundred-and-twenty were given to the Levites, v.46,47?

160. Who is it that really dishonours

the Word, and blasphemers the Name, of God Most High?—he who believes, and teaches others to believe, that such acts, as those above recorded, were really perpetrated by Moses under express Divine sanction and command, or he who declares that such commands as these could never have emanated from the Holy and Blessed One, the All-Just and All-Loving, the Father of the spirits of all flesh,—that we must not, dare not, believe this,—that we are bound not to do so by the express authority of that Divine Law, which we hear in our hearts, which is written in our consciences, and answers there to the voice which speaks to us from without, D.xiii.1-3,—that we *must not* ‘hear’ such doctrine as this, no, not though all the Doctors and Divines in the world should assert it, and appeal to any number of prophecies or miracles to prove it,—nay, not though ‘the signs or wonders, whereof they spake to us,’ should ‘come to pass’ before our very eyes. For, when we hear these things from our fellow-men, however great in learning or high in authority, however near and dear to us, even the ‘friend which is as our own soul,’ we must consider in our hearts that at such times ‘the Living God, our God, is proving us, to know whether we love the Living God, our God,’—His Truth, His Righteousness, and the honour of His Holy Name,—more than all the precepts and teachings of men, ‘with all our heart and with all our soul.’

161. It may be well, however, at once to show that, besides involving the above incredible statements, the narrative itself, as it now stands, is unhistorical here as elsewhere.

(i) We are told that Aaron died on ‘the first day of the fifth month’ of the fortieth year of the wanderings, N.xxxiii.38, and they mourned for him a month, N.xx.29.

(ii) After this, ‘king Arad the Canaanite fought against Israel, and took some of them prisoners;’ whereupon the Israelites attacked these Canaanites, and utterly destroyed them and their cities, N.xxi.1-3,—for which two transactions we may allow another month.

(iii) Then they ‘journeyed from Mount Hor, by the way of the Red Sea, to compass the land of Edom,’ N.xxi.4, and the people murmured, and were plagued with fiery serpents, and Moses set up the serpent of brass,

N.xxi.5-9,—for all which we must allow, at least, a fortnight.

(iv) They now marched, and made nine encampments, N.xxi.10-20, for which we cannot well allow less than a month.

‘We believe that at every station, at least three days’ rest must have been required.’ KURTZ, iii.p.251.

(v) Then they sent messengers to Sihon, who ‘gathered all his people together, and fought against Israel,’ and ‘Israel smote him with the edge of the sword,’ and ‘possessed his land from Arnon unto Jabbok,’ and ‘took all these cities, and dwelt in all the cities of the Amorites, in Heshbon and all the villages thereof,’ N.xxi.21-25,—for which we may allow another month.

(vi) After that ‘Moses sent to spy out Jaazer, and they took the villages thereof,’ and drove out the Amorites that were there,’ N.xxi.32,—say, in another fortnight.

(vii) Then they ‘turned up by the way of Bashan, and Og, the king of Bashan, went out against them, and they smote him, and his sons, and all his people, until there was none left him alive,’ and they possessed his land.’ N.xxi.33-35. For all this work of capturing ‘threescore cities, fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, besides unwalled towns, a great many,’ D.iii.4,5, we must allow, at the very least, a month.

162. Thus, then, from the ‘first day of the fifth month,’ on which Aaron died, to the completion of the conquest of Og, king of Bashan, we cannot reckon less altogether than *six months*, (and, indeed, even then the events will have been crowded one upon another in a most astonishing, and really impossible, manner,) and are thus brought down to the *first day of the eleventh month*, the very day on which Moses is stated to have addressed the people in the plains of Moab. D.i.3.

163. And now what room is there for the other events, which are recorded in the book of Numbers as having occurred between the conquest of Bashan and the address of Moses? The chief of these were—

(1) The march forward to the plains of Moab, N.xxii.1;

(2) Balak’s sending twice to Balaam, his journey, and prophesying, xxii.2-xxiv;

(3) Israel’s ‘abiding’ in Shittim, and committing whoredom with the daughters of Moab, xxv.1-3;

(4) The death of 24,000 by the plague, xxv.9;

(5) The second numbering of the people, xxvi;

(6) The war upon Midian, above considered, during which they ‘burnt all their cities, and all their goodly castles,’ &c., and surely must have required a month or six weeks for such a transaction.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

164. The obvious inference from all the above facts is, that such a narrative as that of the Exodus could never,—in its present form, and, as a whole, at all events,—have been written by Moses, or by any one who had actually taken part in the scenes which it professes to describe. As HÄVERNICK says, while defending the traditionary view, *Pent.* p.90:—

If the Pentateuch would fully maintain its right to the position which it claims, as the work of Moses and the commencement of the sacred records of the covenant-people, it must fulfil the requisition of showing itself to be a work *historically true*,—containing a history which shall vindicate itself by critical examination, as maintaining invariably the character of perfect truth, in reference to the assumed period of its composition.

And so HENGSTENBERG, *Pent.* ii.283:—

It is the unavoidable fate of a spurious historical work of any length, to be involved in contradictions. This must be the case to a very great extent with the Pentateuch, if it be not genuine. . . . If the Pentateuch is spurious, its histories and laws have been fabricated in successive portions, and were committed to writing in the course of centuries by different individuals. From such a mode of origination a mass of contradictions is inseparable, and the improving hand of a later editor would never be capable of entirely obliterating them. From these remarks it appears that freedom from contradictions is much more than the *conditio sine quâ non* of the genuineness of the Pentateuch. . . . It may be thought that Moses, in the history of *ancient* times, found contradictions, and repeated the tradition without removing them. Where, however, Moses narrates what he himself spoke, did, or saw, there every real contradiction becomes a witness against the genuineness.

165. Hereafter we shall consider the many other clear signs, which the books of the Pentateuch give, upon close inspection, of the *manner*, as well as of the *age or ages*, in which they have been composed.

But, meanwhile, if we would give due honour to the Bible, as containing a message from God to our souls, it is surely necessary that we take ourselves, in the first place, and teach others to take, a right and true view, both of the contents of the Book and of the nature of its Inspiration.

166. Thus, instead of looking to

the Bible for revelations of scientific or historical facts, which God has never promised to disclose in this way, by sudden supernatural communications, without the use of human powers of intellect, and without due labour spent in the search after truth, we shall have recourse to it for that which God has there in His Providence laid up in store for our use,—food for the inner man, supplies of spiritual strength and consolation, living words of power to speak to our hearts and consciences, and wake us up to daily earnestness of faith and duty. The very Book of Truth will then cheer us with the assurance of Divine help and blessing, while we engage ourselves devoutly and faithfully in such a work as that which now lies before us, and diligently exercise the best faculties of mind, which God has given us, in searching into the true origin and meaning of the Bible narrative, and its relation to other facts of science or history.

167. And this may be the step, which God in His Providence calls us to take in the present age, in advance of the past generation, with reference to the subject now before us. In the time of Galileo it was heresy to say that the sun stood still and the earth went round it. In far later times, the days of the childhood of many now living, it was thought by many heresy to say that the fossil bones, dug up within the earth, were not the signs of Noah's Flood, or to maintain that Death was in the world, and pain, and multiplied destruction of living creatures by fire and flood, millions of years before the first man had sinned. Yet all these are now recognised as *facts*, which cannot be disputed, which our very children should be taught to know. And good men will even set themselves down to wrest the plain meaning of the Scriptures into a forced conformity with these admitted results of modern science.

168. But, in this our day, by the Gracious Favour of the 'Father of Lights, the Giver of every good and perfect gift,' other sciences, besides astronomy and geology, have sprung into sudden growth, and have attained

already a wonderful development. And though many of these were scarcely known even by name to the men of the last generation, their elements are now taught, as first principles, in the institutions of our great towns, and in many a well-ordered village-school. And, in like manner, we may be sure, the results of criticism, applied to the examination of the letter of the Scriptures, will also soon be acknowledged as *facts*, which must be laid as the basis of all sound religious teaching.

169. In view of this change, which, I believe, is near at hand, and in order to avert the shock, which our children's faith must otherwise experience, when they find, as they certainly will before long, that the Bible can no longer be regarded as infallibly true in matters of history as well as science,—as we value their reverence and love for the Sacred Book,—let us teach them at once to know that they are not to look for the inspiration of the Holy One, which breathes through its pages, in respect of any such matters as these, which the writers wrote as men, with the same liability to error from any cause as other men, and where they must be judged as men, as all other writers would be, by the just laws of criticism.

170. Let us rather teach them to look for and discern the sign of God's Spirit, speaking to them in the Bible, in that of which their own hearts alone can be the judges, of which the heart of the simple child can judge as well as—often, alas! better than—that of the self-willed philosopher, critic, or sage,—in that which speaks to the witness for God within them, the Reason and Conscience, to which alone, under God Himself, whose voice it utters in the secrets of his inner being, each man is ultimately responsible. Let us bid them look for it in that within the Bible, which tells them of what is pure and good, holy and loving, faithful and true, which speaks from God's Spirit directly to their spirits, though clothed with the outward form of a law, or parable, or proverb, or narrative,—in that which they will feel and know in themselves to be righteous and excellent, however they may perversely

choose the base and evil,—in that, which makes the living man leap up, as it were, in the strength of sure conviction, which no arguments could bring, no dogmas of Church or Council enforce, saying, as the Scripture words are uttered, which answer to the Voice of Truth within, 'These words are God's,—not the flesh, the outward matter, the mere letter, but the inward core and meaning of them,—for they are spirit, they are life.'

171. But then, too, let us teach them to recognise the voice of God's Spirit, in whatever way, by whatever ministry, He vouchsafes to speak to the children of men; and to realise the solid comfort of the thought, that,—not only in the Bible, but also out of the Bible,—not to us Christians only, but to our fellow-men of all climes and countries, ages and religions,—the same Gracious Teacher is revealing, in different measures, according to His own good pleasure, the hidden things of God.

172. Thus, for instance, we have the noble words of CICERO, preserved by LACTANTIUS, *Div. Inst.* vi. 8.

Law, properly understood, is no other than right reason, agreeing with nature, spread abroad among all men, ever consistent with itself, eternal, whose office is to summon to duty by its commands, to deter from vice by its prohibitions,—which, however, to the good never commands or forbids in vain, never influences the wicked either by commanding or forbidding. In contradiction to this Law nothing can be laid down, nor does it admit of partial or entire repeal. Nor can we be released from this Law either by vote of the senate or decree of the people. Nor does it require any commentator or interpreter besides itself. Nor will there be one Law at Athens, and another at Rome, one now, and another hereafter: but one eternal, immutable, Law will both embrace all nations and at all times. And there will be one common Master, as it were, and Ruler of all, namely, GOD, the Great Originator, Expositor, Enactor, of this Law; which Law whoever will not obey, will be flying from himself, and, having treated with contempt his human nature, will in that very fact pay the greatest penalty, even if he shall have escaped other punishments, as they are commonly considered.

Well might the Christian philosopher observe that the heathen has here depicted, 'that holy, heavenly, Law with a voice almost divine,' and that he regards such persons, 'speaking thus the truth without design,' as 'divining by some kind of Inspiration.'

173. And the same divine Teacher, we cannot doubt, revealed also to the Sikh Gooroos such truths as these: (CUNNINGHAM's *Hist. of the Sikhs*, p.355-6.)

The True Name is GOD, without fear, without enmity, the Being without Death, the Giver of Salvation.

Remember the primal Truth, Truth which was before the world began, Truth which is, and Truth, Nanuk O, which will remain.

How can Truth be told? How can falsehood be unravelled?

O Nanuk, by following the Will of GOD, as by Him ordained.

One Self-existent, Himself the Creator, O Nanuk, One continueth, another never was, and never will be.

My mind dwells upon One, Him who gave the soul and the body.

Numerous Mahomets have there been, and multitudes of Brahmas, Vishnus, and Sivas, thousands of Peers and Prophets, and tens of thousands of Saints and Holy men;

But the Chief of Lords is the One Lord, the true name of God.

O Nanuk! the qualities of God, without end, beyond reckoning, who can understand?

174. Here, again are prayers in use among the Gallas of North-Eastern Africa, as taken down from their lips. (TUTSCHER's *Dict. of the Galla Language*, p.84.)

Good God of this earth, my Lord! Thou art above me, I am below Thee.

When misfortune comes to me, as trees keep off the sun from me, mayest Thou keep off misfortune! My Lord, be Thou my shadow!

Calling upon Thee, I pass the day: calling upon Thee, I pass the night: when this moon rises, do not forsake me.

GOD, thou goest holding the bad and the good in Thy hand: my Lord, let us not be killed: we, Thy worms, are praying to Thee.

A man, who knows not evil and good, may not anger Thee: if once he knew it, and was not willing to know it, this is wicked, treat him as it pleases Thee. If he formerly did not learn, do Thou, GOD, my Lord, teach him: if he hears not the language of men, he learns Thy language.

GOD, Thou hast made all the animals and men that live upon the earth: the corn also upon this earth, on which we are to live, hast Thou made, we have not made it. Thou hast given us strength, Thou hast given us cattle and corn: we worked with them, and the seed grew up for us.

With the corn, which Thou didst let grow for us, men were satisfied. The corn in the house has been burnt up: who has burnt the corn in the house? Thou knowest!

A single man has chased away all our people from their houses; the children and their mother has been scattered, like a flock of turkeys, hither and thither. The murderous enemy took the curly-headed child out of his mother's hand and killed him. Thou hast permitted all this to be done. Why hast thou done this? Thou knowest!

The corn which thou lettest grow, dost Thou show to our eyes: the hungry man looks at it and is comforted. When the corn blooms, Thou sendest butterflies and locusts into it, locusts and doves: all this comes from Thy hand, Thou hast caused this to be done. Why hast Thou done this? Thou knowest!

My Lord, spare these who pray to Thee! As a thief, stealing a man's corn, is bound by the owner of the corn, thus do not thou bind, O Lord! Binding the beloved one, Thou settest free with love [= whom Thou lovest Thou chastenest, but in mercy pardonest.] If I am beloved by Thee, so set me free, I entreat Thee from my heart! If I do not pray to Thee from my heart, Thou hearest me not. If I pray to Thee with my heart, Thou knowest it, and art gracious unto me.

MORNING PRAYER.

O GOD, Thou hast let me pass the night in peace: let me pass the day in peace! Wherever I may go, upon my way, which Thou madest peaceable for me, O GOD, lead my steps. When I have spoken, keep off calumny from me: when I am hungry, keep me from murmuring: when I am satisfied, keep me from pride. Calling upon Thee, I pass the day, O Lord, who hast no Lord!

EVENING PRAYER.

O GOD, Thou hast let me pass the day in peace: let me pass the night in peace, O Lord, who hast no Lord! There is no strength but in Thee: Thou alone hast no obligation. Under Thy hand I pass the day! under Thy hand I pass the night! Thou art my Mother, Thou my Father!

175. These words, also, were written by one who had no Pentateuch or Bible to teach him, but who must have learned such living truths as these by the secret teaching of the Spirit of God. (*Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal*, vi.p.484-487, 750-756, quoted in H. H. WILSON's *Works*.)

Thou, O GOD, art the Author of all things which have been made, and from Thee will originate all things which are to be made. Thou art the Maker and the Cause of all things made. There is none other but Thee.

He is my GOD, who maketh all things perfect. Meditate upon Him, in whose hands are life and death.

I believe that GOD made man, and that He maketh every thing. He is my Friend.

Let faith in GOD characterise all your thoughts, words, and actions. He, who serveth GOD, places confidence in nothing else.

If the remembrance of GOD be in your hearts, ye will be able to accomplish things which are impracticable. But those who seek the paths of GOD are few!

O foolish one! GOD is not far from you: He is near you. You are ignorant; but he knoweth every thing, and is careful in bestowing.

Care can avail nothing; it devoureth life: for those things shall happen, which GOD shall direct.

Remember GOD, for He endued your body

with life: remember that Beloved One, who placed you in the womb, reared and nourished you.

O God, thou art, as it were, exceeding riches; Thy regulations are without compare; Thou art the chief of every world, yet remainest invisible.

Take such food and raiment as it may please GOD to provide you with: you require naught besides.

What hope can those have elsewhere, even if they wandered over the whole earth, who abandon God?

It will be impossible for you to profit anything, if you are not with GOD, even if you were to wander from country to country.

Have no desires, but accept what circumstances may bring before you; because, whatever GOD pleaseth to direct, can never be wrong.

All things are exceeding sweet to those who love GOD; they would never style them bitter, even if filled with poison; on the contrary, they would accept them as if they were ambrosia.

Adversity is good, if on account of GOD; but it is useless to pain the body. Without GOD, the comforts of wealth are unprofitable.

Do unto me, O GOD, as Thou thinkest best: I am obedient to Thee. My disciples! behold no other GOD; go nowhere but to Him.

Condemn none of those things, which the Creator hath made. Those are His holy servants, who are satisfied with them.

We are not creators: the Creator is a distinct Being; He can make whatever He desireth, but we can make nothing.

GOD ever fostereth His creatures, even as a mother serves her offspring, and keepeth it from harm.

O GOD, Thou who art the Truth, grant me contentment, love, devotion, and faith. Thy servant prayeth for true patience, and that he may be devoted to Thee.

He, that formed the mind, made it as it were a temple for Himself to dwell in; for GOD liveth in the mind, and none other but GOD.

O my friend, recognise that Being, with whom thou art so intimately connected; think not that GOD is distant, but believe that, like thy own shadow, He is ever near thee.

If you call upon GOD, you will be able to subdue your imperfections, and the evil inclinations of your mind will depart from you; but they will return to you again, when you cease to call upon Him.

176. Many other like passages might be quoted from the writings of pious heathens. And surely it may be said of the writers of such words, 'These men were not far from the Kingdom of God.' Rather, let us say, they had already entered the Kingdom: with their earnest 'violence' they had 'taken it by force,' Matt. xi. 12. The Living Word had been speaking in their hearts, and they had heard the Divine Voice,

and believed, and obeyed it. The Light had been shining in their darkness—

'The True Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world,' St. John i. 9— and they had received it, and rejoiced in it; while as yet no Gospel message had reached them from the lips of Apostles, or by the labours of Christian Missionaries. It is, I repeat, one of the strongest confirmations of our faith and hope in God to know this—that in all ages of the world, among all nations, there are signs, like these, that one and the self-same Spirit of Grace has been enlightening, strengthening, and comforting the minds of our fellow-men.

177. Yet, with all this, we cannot be blind to the supreme excellence of that Book, which tells us God's Truth, and declares the Divine Will, more fully and authoritatively than any other, and which we therefore call the 'Word of God'—the Bible. Laying aside the notion of its infallible accuracy, in matters of scientific or historical truth,—admitting, as we must, that it contains many legendary narratives, and even much, in the Hebrew Scriptures, which, considered in the light of Christianity, we must pronounce to be defective in a moral and religious point of view, unworthy of that Divine Author, to whom by so many the whole has been directly ascribed,—yet still, throughout the sacred writings, both of the Old and New Testament, there breathes a Divine Spirit of life and holiness, such as we find nowhere else in the whole compass of heathen literature.

178. Thus, then, while we are sure that the 'Word of God' will be heard oftentimes by the pious heart in the utterances of heathen men,—just as, we know, there are passages in the apocryphal writings, *e.g.* in Ecclesiasticus, which, though not parts of the canonical Scriptures, we yet feel to be living words of Truth, and, as such, divinely inspired,—yet still, in all the writings of heathen men that we know of, there is nothing to compare with the devotional Psalms, or with the prophecies of Isaiah or Jeremiah,—still less, with the teachings of St. Paul and St. John. Whatever may be thought of its inspiration and

authority, the Bible must be confessed to be a Book *sui generis*,—unlike any other book or collection of books whatever, which have originated among heathen nations,—unique in the history of the world.

179. But, further, knowing what we do of the gross and frightful idolatries, which were practised by the Israelites generally down to the very time of the Captivity,—if not even during the exile,—the *spirituality* of the Hebrew Scriptures, and the clear views expressed in them as to the Unity, the Majesty, the Holiness, the Goodness, of God, and the perfect purity of the Divine Law, are indeed amazing, and afford to the unprejudiced mind an overwhelming proof, that the writers were divinely inspired.

180. We know, for instance, that *before* the Captivity—in Judah, as well as in Israel—human sacrifices were freely offered,—nay, that Jerusalem itself was habitually profaned with the ‘innocent blood’ of firstborn children, who were made to ‘pass through’ the fire,—in other words, were burnt to death,—as victims, in honour of the idol whom they worshipped, Moloch or Baal.

But this strange fact is of so much importance, and is so little considered in judging of the moral and religious state of Israel before the Captivity, that it may be well to produce at once the proofs of the truth of this statement.

181. Let the reader, then, consider well the following passages.

‘The children of Judah have done evil in my sight, saith Jehovah : they have set their abominations in the House which is called by my Name, to pollute it. And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire,—which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart.’ Jer.vii.30,31.

‘They have forsaken me, and have estranged this place, and have burned incense in it unto other gods, whom neither they nor their fathers have known, nor the kings of Judah, and have filled this place with the blood of innocents: they have built also the high places of Baal, to burn their sons with fire for burnt-offerings unto Baal, which I commanded not, nor spake it, neither came it into my mind.’ Jer.xix.4,5.

‘Yea, they sacrificed their sons and their daughters unto devils, and shed innocent blood, the blood of their sons and of their daughters,

whom they sacrificed unto the idols of Canaan, and the land was polluted with blood.’ Ps.cvi.37,38.

182. It is plain that in the above passages the phrase, ‘to shed innocent blood,’ is used with express reference to the sacrifice of young children ; and it appears also that the expression, ‘pass through,’=‘pass through the fire,’ is only an euphemism for ‘burning alive.’ Thus we read—

L.xviii.21, ‘Thou shalt not (let) make any of thy seed *pass through* to Molech,’ comp. L.xx.2, ‘Whosoever he be of the children of Israel . . . that giveth his seed unto Molech, he shall surely be put to death :’ comp. also Jer. xxxii.35, ‘and they built the high places of Baal, which are in the valley of the son of Hinnom, to cause their sons and their daughters to pass through unto Molech, which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind, that they should do this abomination, to cause Judah to sin.’

D.xviii.9,10, ‘Thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations ; there shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to *pass through the fire* :’ comp. D.xii.31, ‘Thou shalt not do so unto Jehovah thy God : for every abomination to Jehovah, which He hateth, have they done unto their gods ; for even their sons and their daughters they have burnt in the fire to their gods.’

And so we read of the king of Moab, that in his distress—

‘He took his eldest son, that should have reigned in his stead, and offered him for a burnt-offering upon the wall,’ 2K.iii.27 ;

and of the people of Sepharvaim that,—

‘They burnt their children in fire to Adramelech, and Anammelech, the gods of Sepharvaim,’ 2K.xvii.31.

183. So, too, the fact that the children were actually *sacrificed* and *burnt to death*,—not merely *dedicated* to the idol, as many suppose,—is plainly shown by the following passages:—

‘Are ye not children of transgression, a seed of falsehood, enflaming yourselves with idols under every green tree, *slaying the children in the valleys under the clefts of the rocks* ?’ Is.lvii.4,5.

‘Moreover, thou hast taken thy sons and thy daughters, whom thou hast borne unto me, and these hast thou sacrificed unto them to be devoured. Is this of thy whoredoms a small matter, that thou hast slain my children, and delivered them to cause them to pass through for them ?’ Ez.xvi.20,21.

‘Yea, declare unto them their abominations, that they have committed adultery, and blood is in their hands, and with their idols have they committed adultery, and have also caused their sons, whom they bare unto me, to pass through for them to devour. . . . For when they had slain their children to their idols, then they came the same day into my Sanctuary

to profane it; and lo, thus have they done in the midst of my House.' Ez.xxiii.37,39.

184. From the above instances we may see what is really meant by 'passing through the fire' in other passages, *e.g.* where it is said of Ahaz, 2K.xvi.3,—

'He walked in the ways of the kings of Israel, yea, and made his son to pass through the fire, according to the abominations of the heathen, whom Jehovah cast out from before the children of Israel;'

and of Manasseh, 2K.xxi.6—

'He made his son to pass through the fire;'

and of the people, 2K.xvii.17—

'They caused their sons and their daughters to pass through the fire:'

while of Josiah it is told 2K.xxiii.10—

'He defiled Tophet, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter to pass through the fire to Molech.'

185. It will be seen that Ahaz and Manasseh are stated to have offered each his son,—not his sons,—and so, in the last passage, we have 'his son or his daughter.' These expressions correspond with the following, from which it would seem that only the *first-born child*, that 'openeth the womb,' whether male or female, was thus offered:—

'I polluted them in their own gifts, in that they caused to pass through all that openeth the womb, that I might make them desolate, to the end that they might know that I am Jehovah.' Ez.xx.26.

And from the following it would appear that the practice continued even after the Captivity:—

'Wherefore say unto the House of Israel, Thus saith the Lord God, Are ye polluted after the manner of your fathers, and commit ye whoredom after their abominations? For when ye offer your gifts, when ye make your sons to pass through the fire, ye pollute yourselves with your idols, even unto this day: and shall I be enquired of by you, O House of Israel?' Ez.xx.30,31.

186. From all the above instances it is sufficiently plain that the Israelites, like the nations around them, practised habitually, in the days of the later kings, the horrid rites of human sacrifice. And, when we also read, 1K.xi.7—

'Then did Solomon build an high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem, and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon'—it can scarcely be doubted that Solomon, too, connived, at all events, at the usual rites, with which these gods were worshipped, and among which are specially reckoned, as we have seen, 2K.iii.27,

xxiii.10, *human sacrifices*. We shall find these observations of considerable importance, as we advance further in our critical enquiries.

187. But, for the present, it will be enough to note that *this* was the state of Judah and Israel, when the great Prophets of the Old Testament lived, and witnessed for God among their people. With such fearful practices, and all the kindred vices of heathenism, the grossest impurities, and most loathsome abominations, prevailing amongst them, even in their most sacred places, 2K.xiv.24, xxiii.7, the language of Isaiah and Jeremiah, breathing the spirit of holy fear and trust and love,—of meek piety and patient faith, and pure self-sacrificing devotion to the cause of truth and righteousness,—can only be regarded as inspired and Divine.

188. We conclude with the following very important words of Bishop THIRLWALL in his recent Charge, p.123.

A great part of the events related in the Old Testament has no more apparent connection with our religion than those of Greek and Roman history. . . . The history, so far as it is a narrative of civil and political transactions, has no essential connection with any religious truth; and if it had been lost, though we should have been left in ignorance of much that we desired to know, our treasure of Christian doctrine would have remained whole and unimpaired. The numbers, migrations, wars, battles, conquests, and reverses, of Israel, have nothing in common with the teaching of Christ, with the way of salvation, with the fruits of the Spirit. They belong to a totally different order of subjects. They are not to be confounded with the spiritual revelation contained in the Old Testament, much less with that fulness of grace and truth, which came by Jesus Christ. Whatever knowledge we may obtain of them is, in a religious point of view, a matter of absolute indifference to us; and if they were placed on a level with the saving truths of the Gospel, they would gain nothing in intrinsic dignity, but would only degrade that with which they are thus associated. Such an association may indeed exist in the minds of pious and even learned men: but it is only by means of an artificial chain of reasoning, which does not carry conviction to all beside. Such questions must be left to every one's private judgment and feeling, which have the fullest right to decide for each, but not to impose their decisions, as the dictates of an infallible authority, on the consciences of others. Any attempt to erect such facts into articles of faith, would be fraught with danger of irreparable evil to the Church, as well as with immediate hurt to numberless souls.

THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 6.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'

Quarterly Review on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

PART II.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1865.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE TO PART II.	77
I. SIGNS OF DIFFERENT AUTHORS IN THE PENTATEUCH	87
II. THE ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC WRITERS	92
III. THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT	94
IV. SIGNS OF LATER DATE IN THE PENTATEUCH	97
V. ADDITIONAL SIGNS OF LATER DATE IN THE PENTATEUCH	101
VI. REPETITIONS IN THE PENTATEUCH	105
VII. WAS SAMUEL THE ELOHISTIC WRITER OF THE PENTATEUCH	108
VIII. INTRODUCTION OF THE NAME JEHOYAH	111
IX. THE DERIVATION OF THE NAME MORIAH	115
X. THE NAMES ELOHIM AND JEHOVAH	119
XI. THE ELOHISTIC PSALMS OF DAVID	122
XII. THE PSALMS OF THE SECOND BOOK	125
XIII. THE SIXTY-EIGHTH PSALM	128
XIV. THE REMAINING ELOHISTIC PSALMS	136
XV. THE JEHOVISTIC PSALMS CONSIDERED	139
XVI. THE JEHOVISTIC NAMES IN THE BOOK OF JUDGES	141
XVII. THE JEHOVISTIC NAMES IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL	146
XVIII. CONCLUDING REMARKS	150
APPENDIX	159

THE Hebrew Scriptures I have examined and appreciated, as I would any other writings of antiquity; and I have bluntly and honestly delivered my sentiments of their merit and demerit, their beauties or imperfections, as becomes a free and impartial examiner. I am well aware that this freedom will, by the many, be considered as an audacious licence, and the cry of *heresy! infidelity! irreligion!* will resound from shore to shore. But my peaceful mind has been long prepared for, and indeed accustomed to, such harsh Cerberean barkings; and experience has made me (not naturally insensible) callous to every injury, that ignorance or malice may have in store for me.

I only enter my protest against downright misrepresentation and calumny. I disclaim and spurn the imputation of irreligion and infidelity. I believe as much as I find sufficient motives of credibility for believing: and without sufficient motives of credibility there can be no rational belief. Indeed, the great mass of mankind have no rational belief. The common Papist and the common Protestant are here on almost equal terms. . . .

The common Papist rests his faith on the supposed *infallibility* of his *Church*. . . . He reads in his catechism, or is told by his catechist, that *the Church cannot err in what she teaches*, and then he is told that this unerring Church is composed only of those, who hold communion with the Bishop of Rome, and believe precisely as he, and the Bishops who hold communion with him, believe. From that moment reason is set aside; authority usurps its place, and implicit faith is the necessary consequence. . . . He dares not doubt: for in his table of sins, which he is obliged to confess, he finds *doubting in matters of faith* to be a grievous crime.

But, on the other hand, is the faith of the common Protestant better founded? He rests it on a *Book*, called the Holy Bible, which he believes to be the *infallible Word of God*. . . . He is taught to believe the Bible to be the *infallible Word of God*, before he has read or can read it; and he sits down to read it, with this prepossession in his mind, that he is reading the *infallible Word of God*. . . . His belief, then, is as implicit as that of the common Papist, and his motives of believing even less specious.

On the whole, then, I think, it may be laid down as an axiom, that the bulk of Christians, whether Papists or Protestants, cannot be said to have a rational faith; because their motives of credibility are not rational motives, but the positive assertions of an assumed authority, which they have never discussed, or durst not question. Their religion is the fruit of unenlightened credulity.—Rev. Dr. A. GEDDES (Rom. Cath. Priest), *Critical Remarks on the Hebrew Scriptures*, 1800, vol. I, p. v.

PREFACE TO PART II.

IT will be seen that, in this Second Part of my work, the argument to prove the non-Mosaic and unhistorical character of the Pentateuch is removed altogether from the ground on which the question was discussed in Part I, and is treated upon other, chiefly philological, grounds. My former book has had, I believe, the effect which I desired, having met with such a reception, generally, at the hands of English readers, as satisfies me that there will now exist a very general feeling among them, that there is certainly *something* in the story of the Exodus, as recorded in the Pentateuch, *which needs to be explained*, and assures me that the requisite attention will be given to the further examination of this important subject. It was my earnest desire and hope to secure such attention from the more thoughtful and intelligent of the Laity, without whose aid nothing, I knew, could be done to deliver the Church of England from the restraints of those time-honoured traditions, which have hitherto checked freedom of thought and speech among her members, and sealed, to a very great extent, the mouths of her doctors and clergy. But, in order to do this, it was absolutely necessary to awaken their interest in the question to be discussed, by treating it, in the first instance, in the most plain and popular manner, and using chiefly such reasoning as would require in the reader no extensive scholarship, no knowledge of the Hebrew tongue or acquaintance with the higher departments of Biblical criticism,—nothing but an honest, English, practical common-sense, with a determination to *know*, if possible, the real truth upon the points at issue, where the argument turns upon matters of every-day life, lying completely within his cognisance, and, when known, to *embrace* and *avow* it.

I must now take a step forward with those, who are resolved to investigate thoroughly the question which has been raised, as to the real origin, age, and authorship of the different portions of the Pentateuch. I shall still, however, bear constantly in mind that my book, to produce the effect which I desire, must be brought within the grasp of an intelligent layman, though unskilled in

Hebrew learning. The difficulty, no doubt, is great, which must be here encountered, if it is to satisfy at once the demands of the scholar and the requirements of the unlearned. But the vital importance of the subject under consideration is such as to leave me no alternative but to make this attempt; and I can have no excuse for sparing any labour, which may help to simplify, as far as possible, the unavoidable difficulties of the case. This will account for the endeavour, which I have made throughout, to make each step of the reasoning plain to the apprehension of the general reader, though a critical scholar may, perhaps, complain that time and space are occupied in clearing ground, which has been cleared for him long ago, and in fortifying a position, which, he may think, needs no defence. I have gone upon the principle of *taking nothing for granted*,—of assuming that my reader will desire to see for himself every step of the argument, and to have each point cleared up completely as he goes. Where, therefore, it has been necessary to appeal to some knowledge of the Hebrew language, I have sought by means of a translation, or in some other way, to supply the information needed to produce conviction in the mind of the unlearned,—sufficiently strong, at all events, to enable him to go on confidently with the train of reasoning, which is followed throughout this Second Part, if less certain than that which would arise from actual acquaintance with the original tongue.

A few words may here be said in reply to my Reviewers. I desire to acknowledge thankfully the hearty welcome and encouragement, which my book has met with from many influential quarters. And I am too well aware of the pain, which its publication must have caused to many excellent persons, to be surprised at receiving some hard words from others. I am sure, however, that the truth will prevail at last, and I shall abide patiently and hopefully the issue of the contest.

Some of my critics have complained that I have set forth *nothing new* in the First Part,—that the objections, which I have stated, had all been heard and answered before. I made, however, no pretence of bringing forward novelties. The very point, indeed, of my argument in Part I was this,—that these difficulties were *not new*, though many of them were new to me, when I first began to engage in these investigations, as, I believe, notwithstanding the assertions of not a few of my critics, they were new to very many of my readers, lay and clerical, when first laid before them. But I expressly said that these contradictions, generally, *had* been noticed by others, and *must* be noticed by every one who would carefully study the Pentateuch, comparing one statement with another. I said, also, that they have never been satisfactorily explained; and I say so still. Having carefully considered the

various replies which have hitherto been made to the First Part of my work, I find no occasion to modify any of its main conclusions; though I have gladly availed myself of suggestions, whether from friends or opponents, which have enabled me to amend, and, not unfrequently, to strengthen, some of my arguments.

But the line of reasoning pursued in the present portion of my work is that, probably, which with many minds will produce a more decided effect. It will be seen that all the elaborate attempts, which have been made to 'explain away' difficulties and 'reconcile' contradictions, are but as breath spent in vain, when the *composite* character of the story of the Exodus is once distinctly recognised, and the Pentateuch falls to pieces, as it were, in the reader's hands, the different ages of the different writers being established beyond a doubt, and clearly exhibited. It was, perhaps, my knowledge of the overwhelming amount and weight of this evidence, and of much more of the same kind to be produced hereafter, which led me to express myself in the First Part with an assured confidence in the certainty of my conclusions, which some of my reviewers have condemned, as scarcely warranted, in their opinion, by the premisses, even if they were admitted to be true.

Others, again, have said that such a work as mine was unnecessary, because in these days the notion of literal inspiration is generally abandoned. 'It is but fighting, therefore, with a shadow, to attack the doctrine of Scripture infallibility, which is a thing of the past, and has either already died away, or is fast dying away, under the influence of modern science, and amidst the growing intelligence of the age.' But is this statement true? I quoted in the Introduction to Part I, words addressed to the junior members of the University of Oxford by one of their select preachers. Could any language have set forth more explicitly the duty of regarding the Bible, as in its every 'sentence, word, syllable, letter—where shall we stop?'—infallible and Divine? But many of that writer's best friends, it is said, regret the delivery and publication of those sermons. 'It is not to be supposed that such views are at all widely entertained within the Church in the present day.' What, then, shall be said of the following extracts?

The Rev. E. GARBETT, M.A., 'Select Preacher and Boyle Lecturer,' in a sermon also preached before the University of Oxford, Nov. 16, 1802, writes as follows:—

But this notion of an *infallible Bible*, and of the *historical truth of its contents*, is no more, it is replied, than the mistake of a popular religion, of which the severer criticism and more accurate habits of modern thought have undermined the very foundations. . . . *It is the clear teaching of those doctrinal formularies, to which we of the Church of England have expressed our solemn assent, and no honest interpretation of her language can get rid of it.* p.9.

If the belief in the infallibility of the Scripture be a falsehood, the Church founded upon it must be a living fraud; . . . in all consistent reason, we must accept the whole of the inspired autographs or reject the whole, as from end to end unauthoritative and worthless. p.10.

The Rev. Dr. BAYLEE, the Principal of St. Aidan's College, Birkenhead, which, as the Bishop of WINCHESTER states, *Charge*, 1862, p. 23—

now contributes *the twentieth part of the candidates for the whole English Church Ministry*,—

writes as follows in his Manual—‘BAYLEE’s Verbal Inspiration’—published ‘chiefly for the use of the students of St. Aidan’s College.’

The whole Bible, as a revelation, is a declaration of the Mind of God towards His creatures, on all the subjects of which the Bible treats. p.6.

What I believe to be the truth is this,—the Bible is God’s Word, in the same sense as if He had made use of no human agent, but had Himself spoken it, as we know He did the Decalogue. p.33.

Modern Science, with all its wonderful advances, has discovered not one single inaccurate allusion to physical truth, in all the countless illustrations employed in the Bible. p.42.

The Bible cannot be less than verbally inspired. Every word, every syllable, every letter, is just what it would be, had God spoken from heaven without any human intervention. p.48.

Every scientific statement is infallibly accurate, all its history and narrations of every kind are without any inaccuracy. The words and phrases have a grammatical and philological accuracy, such as is possessed by no human composition. p.62.

[We have similar language from the Bishop (BICKERSTETH) of RYON in his recent *Charge*, 1864: see the Adv. to this edition.

Let me implore of you to aim at establishing the flock committed to your charge in the well-grounded assurance, that *the whole Bible is the infallible record of the Mind and Will of God*, conveyed by direct inspiration to holy men of old, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. *The Bible, like its Author, is pure, unchangeable, truth—truth without admixture of error.*

And so says the Bishop (GRAY) of CAPETOWN, see my (so-called) ‘Trial,’ p. 390:—

The Church regards, and expects all its officers to regard, the Holy Scriptures as teaching *pure and simple truth*.]

After considering the above facts, will anyone say that there is no cause for the publication of such a work as mine?

Again, very grave censure has been passed by some upon the language which I have used, with reference to the manner in which the ‘books of Moses’ are referred to in the New Testament. On this point I shall say no more at present, than that I believe that, in presence of the plain facts of the case, I have supported the orthodox faith by those suggestions, which I have made in the Preface to Part I, in the *only* way in which it can be supported, as far as this particular question is concerned.

I am, of course, aware that some serious questions are raised, with respect to the popular views of Christianity, by the consideration of the facts, which are here, as I believe, *proved* in reference to the Pentateuch; and many of my Reviewers, as well as some private correspondents, have urged upon me the desirableness of stating at once in what way the usual elements of Christian doctrine appear to be affected by the unhistorical character of the Pentateuch. But, however I may wish to satisfy my own mind upon this point, it is impossible to do so, till it is seen what residuum of real fact is left behind, when the Pentateuch is thoroughly examined. This only I repeat once more,—whatever difficulties may be raised by such criticism, yet the recognition of the gradual

growth of Jesus, as the Son of Man, in human knowledge and science of all kinds, such as that which concerns the question of the age and authorship of the Pentateuch, is perfectly compatible with—rather, is absolutely required by—the most orthodox faith in His Divinity, as the Eternal Son of God. And I believe that this view of the case is far more *reverent* and *becoming* than that which is so very commonly adopted, viz. that, *knowing* how the case really stood, He yet adopted the popular language of the day, and so left His countrymen and disciples in total ignorance of the facts of history and criticism, of which He Himself was fully cognisant, and by His silence, at all events—or even by direct statements—confirmed their mistaken notions on so important a question.

But leaving these Replies and Reviews, most of which are by anonymous authors, I am naturally most anxious to see what the Bishops and Doctors of the Church of England will say upon the subject of my book, and how they will act in the present emergency. At the time when I write, only one of the English Bench of Bishops, the Bishop of ROCHESTER, has, as far as I am aware, expressed himself at any length with reference to the present question. And *he* has stated, in his published letter to the clergy of his Diocese, that he is ‘no Hebrew or German scholar,’ and, therefore, being necessarily ignorant, at present, of the real facts of the case, he can scarcely be regarded as a fair and competent judge in the matter.

The Bishop of LONDON in his recent Charge—admirable in respect of the liberal and charitable spirit which it breathes throughout,—while saying that—

it would never do to lay down that a clergyman is bound not to inquire,—
and that—

we cannot for a moment admit any theory, which, teaching that as clergymen they were bound to an unquestioning adherence to the Church’s standards, removes the Clergy out of the category of inquiring honest men, thus robbing the Church of all that weight of testimony in favour of its doctrines, which is derived from the heartfelt free adherence of so many of the most intelligent and best men of each generation, who have found their highest happiness as its ministers,—

and while further saying that—

a clergyman *cannot* altogether avoid such questions—he is called every day, in his common occupations, to announce that he has an opinion on one side or the other of, at least, some of them—he cannot, therefore, shut his eyes to them,—

yet adds that—

if such inquiry leads to *doubt*,—and if the doubt ends in disbelief of the Church’s doctrines,—of course he will resign his office as one of the Church’s authorised teachers.

Now let us consider what this leads to. Let us suppose a clergyman to begin to ‘inquire,’ having a difficulty about the Deluge put before him by some intelligent layman of his flock. If he does this, he will assuredly soon learn that the results of *geological* science forbid our believing in an *Universal* Deluge, such as the Bible manifestly speaks of. He will find also that *mathematical*

and *physical* science, as well as the plain texts of Scripture, equally forbid our believing in a *partial* Deluge, such as some have supposed, since that involves an Universal Flood. Rather, without any appeal to science at all, if only he allows himself to 'think' upon the subject, and to realise to his own mind the necessary conditions of the supposed event, he will need only a common practical judgment to convince him that the story, which is told in the book of Genesis, is utterly incredible.

It is extremely probable, then, that any such clergyman, if he once begins to 'inquire,' must needs come very soon to *doubt*, and before long to *disbelieve*, the literal historical truth of the Scripture account of the Deluge. Rather, let me ask, does any intelligent clergyman at this day—anyone who has allowed himself to 'think' upon the subject, as he would think about any other recorded fact of ancient history—really believe in the historical truth of that story? Do the Bishops and Doctors of the English Church believe in it? If they do not, then do not these Divines, one and all, 'disbelieve the Church's doctrine' on this particular point, whilst yet, in common with all their fellow-clergy, they use habitually that solemn form of address to Almighty God in the Baptismal Service, which expressly assumes the reality and historical truthfulness of the story of the Noachian Deluge—

Almighty and everlasting God, who of thy great mercy didst save Noah and his family in the Ark from perishing by water?

It may, indeed, be said, 'There was a Deluge of *some kind or other*, and this is only a legendary reminiscence of it.' But the Church Prayer-Book does not mean this. When those formularies were laid down, and the Clergy were bound by a solemn subscription to declare their 'unfeigned assent and consent to all things written in the Book of Common Prayer,' it was assuredly meant to bind them to express an unfeigned belief in the story of the Deluge, *as it is told in these chapters of Genesis*, and not to some imaginary Flood of any kind, which anyone may choose at his pleasure to substitute for it. Are, then, all these—Prelates, as well as ordinary Clergy—to resign at once their sacred offices, because they disbelieve the Church's doctrine on this point?

But what are they to do under these circumstances—those, I mean, who have their eyes open to the real facts of the case, and who cannot bear to utter what they know to be untrue in the face of God and the Congregation? Many—perhaps, most—will get rid of the difficulty, with satisfaction to their own minds in some way, by falling back upon the notion above referred to, that the account in Genesis is a legendary narrative, however incorrect and unhistorical, of some real matter of fact in ancient days. Others will justify themselves in still using such a form of Prayer, by considering that they are acting in a merely *official* capacity, as ministers of the

National Church, and administrators of the laws which the main body of the Church has approved, and has not yet rescinded.

But what shall be said to those, who cannot conscientiously adopt either of the above methods of relieving themselves from the burden of the present difficulty, and yet feel it to be impossible to continue any longer to use such words in a solemn address to the Almighty? I see no remedy for these, but to *omit such words*—to disobey the law of the Church on this point, and take the consequences of the act.

Is not this the way by which, in England, all laws become disused and practically abrogated, long before they are formally and legally annulled? At this moment, how many are there of the Clergy who never read the Athanasian Creed? And how many are there of the Bishops, who make no enquiry as to whether, or not, their clergy do use this creed,—who do not therefore, *compel* them to use it?

And the circumstances of the times are such, that those, who know the facts of the case, dare not be silent any longer, while yet it is possible, by a timely recognition of the truth, and by adopting wise and liberal measures suited to the present emergency, to save the Church of England from the ruin which threatens her by the depreciation of the standard of learning among the Clergy. It is a fact well known that the ablest minds are being daily excluded from her ministry, and men of inferior attainments, from St. Aidan's and other similar institutions, admitted in large numbers to it—to such an extent, indeed, that in 1861, according to the statement of the Bishop of Winchester, out of 670 candidates for Holy orders, considerably more than *one-third*, viz. 241, were 'Literates'—[a phrase which, as the Bishop of St. David's has told us, 'often means the same thing' as 'illiterates']. It was only a *question of time* whether these results of critical inquiry should be brought to the knowledge of English Churchmen in this our own day or in the days of the next generation. There is yet a season in which we may work together, to open the barriers, which at present shut out from the National Church so many men of learning and genius and piety, who might be numbered among her strongest friends, and to get rid of those stringent fetters of subscription, by which the young men of promise, at each of our Universities, refuse any longer to be bound.

It is our duty at such a time as this to speak out plainly what we know, even though, in so doing, we should be charged with disobeying the written law of the Church. More especially are we bound to do so, when we know that her voice has for a long time not been heard—that it cannot now be heard—that the Church, as a Body, is not allowed to speak; for no one can suppose

that the present Houses of Convocation, where the Clergy are most imperfectly represented and the Laity not at all, can be regarded as in any sense expressing the mind of the National Church. Her hands, we know, are tied, and her whole frame cramped with formulæ of bygone days, which she once adopted, as suited to her then state of development, but which she has now outgrown. But we know also what her voice *would* be, if she could only freely utter it this day, as she did in the days of the Reformation. We are sure that she would bid her children 'buy the TRUTH' at all cost, without respect to Church censures or formularies,—that, if she could only now express her mind, and the whole spirit of her teaching, her language would be in full accordance with those words of one of her most distinguished modern prelates, (Archbishop WHATELY on *Bacon's Essays*, p. 10) :

He who propagates a delusion, and he who connives at it when already existing, both alike tamper with truth. We must neither *lead* nor *leave* men to mistake falsehood for truth. Not to deceive, is to deceive. The giving, or not correcting, false reasons for right conclusions, false grounds for right belief, false principles for right practice,—the holding forth, or fostering, false consolations, false encouragements, or false sanctions, or conniving at their being held forth, or believed, are all pious frauds. This springs from, and it will foster and increase, a want of veneration for Truth : it is an affront put on the ' Spirit of Truth.'

It is true, the above passage was probably not written with the remotest idea of its being applied to the present controversy. It was written, as we may suppose, with a more direct reference to what the Archbishop considered to be our duty, as Members and Ministers of a Protestant Church, in our relations with Romanism. But not the less truly or forcibly—because undesignedly—does it express the very spirit of Protestantism, the spirit of our National Church. In such words as these we hear the very tone in which she would speak to us now, if she could only make her voice to be heard, and would exhort her children, and enjoin her Clergy, to search after and to speak the Truth, since thus only can they be true children and servants of God. And, indeed, the Bishop of LONDON, in his recent Charge, distinctly recognises free inquiry after Truth, as the very principle of our Protestant Church :

As to *free inquiry*, what shall we do with it? Shall we frown upon it, denounce it, try to stifle it? This will do no good, even if it be right. But after all we are Protestants. We have been accustomed to speak a good deal of the right and duty of private judgment. It was *by the exercise of this right, and the discharge of this duty*, that our fathers freed their and our souls from Rome's time-honoured falsehoods.

If this be true, it is impossible to suppose that she would encourage and enjoin 'free inquiry' as a *duty* on the one hand, and, on the other, check it in the very outset, by requiring that any of her Clergy, who, in these days of progress in learning and science of every kind, should arrive by means of such 'inquiry' at any conclusions different from those, which were thought right three centuries ago, must at once abdicate their sacred functions, and go out of her Ministry.

I assert, however, without fear of contradiction, that there are

multitudes now of the more intelligent Clergy, who do *not* believe in the historical truth of the Noachian Deluge, as recorded in the book of Genesis. Yet did ever a layman hear his clergyman speak out distinctly what he thought, and say plainly from the pulpit what he himself believed, and what he would have them to believe, on this point? Did ever a *Doctor* or *Bishop* of the Church do this—at least, in the present day? I doubt not that cases may be found, where such ‘plainness of speech’ has been exercised by the Clergy. But I appeal to the Laity, generally, with confidence. Have you ever heard your Minister—able, earnest, excellent, as you know him to be—tell out plainly to his people the truth which he knows himself about these things? Or if not to the congregation at large—for fear lest the ‘ignorant and unlearned’ should ‘wrest it to their own destruction’—has he ever told these things to you in private, to you, men and women of education and intelligence,—parents of families, teachers of youth,—and so helped you to lay wisely from the first, in the minds of your children and pupils, in order to meet the necessities of this age of advancing science and ‘free inquiry,’ the foundation of a right understanding in respect of these matters? As before, I doubt not that here also exceptions may be found to the general rule. But is not the case notoriously otherwise in the vast majority of instances?

But how can a clergyman be expected to indulge free thought, on some of the most interesting and important questions of physical, historical, and critical science, when he knows that, for arriving at any conclusions on certain points of Biblical criticism, which contradict the notions of our forefathers, living in days of comparative darkness and ignorance in respect of all matters of scientific research, he is in danger of being dragged into the Court of Arches, and of being there ejected, or, if not ejected, at least suspended, from his living, and saddled, it may be, with a crushing weight of debt? Is it any wonder that a young man of University distinction and intellectual activity, however ready he may be, for the love of God and his fellow-men, to engage himself in the holy and blessed, though in respect to this world’s goods often ill-rewarded, labours of the ministry of souls, should yet be found unwilling to subject himself to the ‘tender mercies’ of such a system as this, and so, perhaps, suddenly, in the middle of his life,—when the fire and energy of youth are spent, and the day is too far gone for him to begin work again, and devote his powers to the heavy toil of mastering the details of some new profession, (if even such a profession were open to him, which by the present law of England is not the case,)—find himself deprived of the moderate competence which he had earned by having ‘spurned delights, and lived laborious days,’ and stripped at a stroke of all his means of livelihood, as one of the pains and penalties of thinking?

I have felt obliged to express dissent from one expression in the late Charge of the Bishop of LONDON. But I cannot deny myself the satisfaction of quoting other words of the same Prelate, which show how well he appreciated, at the time when he spoke them, the special needs of the present day.

Wherever a general suspicion is engendered, however unfounded it may be, that something is amiss in our system of religion, which from policy or cowardice we are anxious to conceal, there hidden infidelity will make rapid progress, and many a man of honest mind will in secret be tortured with anxiety, having no leisure to examine for himself the difficulties he has heard of, and be distressed by a painful impression that those, who ought to examine for him, are deliberately or unwittingly banded together to mislead. Thus, as is usual, wherever men take upon themselves to act against God's purposes, that very infidelity, the fear of which scared them from their duty, will grow with tenfold vigour because they have neglected to perform it.

And here it seems well to remark that the critical study of the Bible is more than ever necessary to be encouraged now, from the particular circumstances of our own age and country. Whatever may be thought of the honesty or policy of endeavouring to conceal difficulties and stifle inquiry formerly, the days, when such methods of propping up the truth of God were possible, are at an end. . . . The old times, with their mingled good and evil—the old ideas of the paternal duty of government both in Church and State to lead the mass of men, as it were, blindfold, and to shut up knowledge within the privileged caste of those who were thought likely to make a good use of it, have passed. . . . The old state of things can never be brought back. It is in our own generation and amid the men of our own generation—amid their thoughts, bad as well as good, their questionings and doubtings and shallow disputations, as well as their energetic impatience of concealment and hatred of all formalism, that God has placed the scene of our responsibilities; and it is vain to think that we can do any good amongst them by attempting to teach them on the principles of a departed state of society, and not as their own characters and circumstances require. *Dangers and Safeguards*, p. 83-87.

Can we not trust God's Truth to take care of itself in this world? Must we seek, in our ignorant feeble way, to prop it up by legal enactments, and fence it round by a system of fines and forfeitures and Church anathemas, lest the rude step of some 'free inquirer' should approach too near, and do some fatal injury to the Eternal Truth of God? *Have we no faith in God, the Living God?* And do we not believe that He himself is willing, and surely able as willing, to protect his own honour and to keep in safety the souls of His children, and, amidst the conflict of opinion that will ever be waged in this world in the search after truth,—which may be vehement but need not be uncharitable,—to maintain in each humble, prayerful, heart the essential substance of that Truth which 'maketh wise unto salvation'? Surely, as a friend writes—

To suppose that we can serve God's cause by shutting our eyes to the light, much more to suppose that we can serve it by asserting that we see what we do not see, because we *wish* to see it, is simply *intellectual Atheism*.

And when men declare, as some have done, that there can be no belief in God, no Religion, no laws binding on the conscience, no principles to purify the heart, no authoritative sanction for the most sacred duties of private, social, and public life, unless these old stories of the Pentateuch are received with implicit faith—at least, in their main features—as literally and historically true, is not this really, in however disguised a form, the very depth of Infidelity?

J. W. NATAL.

LONDON: Jan. 24, 1863.

PART II.

THE AGE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH CONSIDERED.

CHAPTER I.

SIGNS OF DIFFERENT AUTHORS IN THE PENTATEUCH.

189. In the First Part of this work we have been considering some of the most remarkable inconsistencies and contradictory statements, which a closer examination of the Pentateuch, as it now lies before us, reveals to the attentive reader. Most of these are of an *arithmetical* character, and *some* of them might be greatly diminished, or, perhaps, got rid of altogether, if it were possible to suppose that the number of warriors in the wilderness was only 6,000, instead of 600,000. But the story itself, as we have seen, forbids such a supposition. Not only is the number of warriors, '600,000 on foot that were men, besides children,' given in round numbers in E.xii.37, N.xi.21, but it is stated more accurately, as 603,550, thrice over in different forms, in E.xxxviii.25-28. And, besides this, the numbers of the armed men of the separate tribes are given on two different occasions, and the sum-total of these twelve tribe-numbers is, in the one case, 603,550, N.i.46, and in the other, 601,730, N.xxvi.51; and, on the first occasion, the separate tribe-numbers and the sum-total are *again*, a second time, accurately repeated in N.ii,—nay, are repeated carefully *twice over*, for the three tribes constituting each of the four camps are numbered and summed up together separately, and then these four sum-totals or camp-

numbers, 186,400, 151,450, 108,100, 157,600, are added together, and make up the same total as before, 603,550.

190. These numbers, indeed, are all *round* numbers, each ending with a *cipher*; and it has been suggested that there may be a clerical error, extending through the whole set of them, and that, if these ciphers be struck out, (which is equivalent to dividing all the numbers by ten,) the sum-total will be reduced to a more manageable number. But, in fact, most of the difficulties will remain really as formidable, with a camp of 60,000 warriors, that is, with a population of 200,000 or 300,000 people, as with the larger camp of 600,000. We should only have to substitute in our imaginations the town of LIVERPOOL or MANCHESTER for the city of LONDON. Could the total number be reduced to about 6,000, *some* of the difficulties might, indeed, as we have said, disappear, but, even then, not *all* of them; for we should still have to imagine a town of 20,000 or 30,000 people, as OXFORD or CAMBRIDGE. But the separate numbers of the tribes in N.i.ii,xxvi, forbid this last reduction, as the numbers do not all consist of so many round *hundreds*.

191. Besides, the number of the *Levites* is expressly fixed by its relation to the number of *firstborns*, N.iii.39-51. These latter were 22,273, a number without a *cipher*, which cannot, therefore, be 'reduced'; and it is stated that these exceeded the male *Levites* by 273, v.46, for each

one of whom a tax of five shekels was paid, and the whole number of shekels so paid is reckoned, v.50, as 1,365. Hence there can be no room for supposing that the whole number of male Levites was any other than 22,000, N.iii.39, numbered separately as Gershonites, 7,600, v.22, Kohathites, 8,600, v.28, Merarites, 6,200, v.34,—the sum of which three numbers, however, is actually 22,300 instead of 22,000, where we have a remarkable inaccuracy, which has to be 'reconciled.' And of these, we are told, 8,580, N.iv.48,—viz. Kohathites, 2,750, v.36, Gershonites, 2,630, v.40, Merarites, 3,200,* v.44,—were 'from thirty years old and upward, even unto fifty years old,' representing (say) 10,000 above the age of twenty, at which the census of the other tribes was taken, N.i.3. But, if there were 10,000 Levites 'from twenty years old and upward,' it is absurd to imagine that there were only 6,000 warriors of all the twelve tribes, and very unreasonable to suppose that there were only 60,000, even if the difficulties of the story would really be relieved by such a supposition.

192. If, therefore, it were still possible to believe that a whole series of numbers, such as the tribe-numbers and totals, had been systematically corrupted and exaggerated in consequence of clerical errors, yet it would then follow that all the above particulars about the Levites and first-borns must have been a pure invention of a later date, implying that the interpolating inventor had no particular reverence for the original text. Besides which, the 'corruption' of the text, required to produce the numbers of the

Pentateuch, must have been of a very peculiar kind. For not only are the twelve tribe-numbers in the first two instances, N.i,ii, so fixed that their sums, taken in different ways, give accurately the first sum-total, 603,550, but in the third case, N.xxvi, *they are all changed*,—each being either increased or diminished by a certain amount,—yet so judiciously changed, that the result is obtained, which was apparently desired, of having the total nearly the same as before, 601,730. It is very plain that this Hebrew author, whoever he may have been, was not so ignorant and helpless in matters of arithmetic as some have imagined.

193. We are thus, it would seem, compelled to adhere to the Scripture number of 600,000 warriors, as that which was *intended* by the sacred writer, whatever contradictions and impossibilities it introduces into the story; and, therefore, these 'arithmetical' arguments are really of the greatest importance, in the consideration of the present question. And they have this special advantage, that they can be clearly stated in definite terms, so as to be readily appreciated by practical men, and are not mixed up with those other difficulties of a *moral* nature, which, however strongly felt by very many, are not realised in the same degree by *all* devout readers of the Bible.

194. Thus, then, whatever process of reduction may be applicable to the immense Hebrew numbers which occur everywhere throughout the Bible,—(and my belief is that these numbers are merely set down loosely at random, in oriental fashion, not exaggerated systematically by mistake, or design, or accident, as some suppose,)—yet with regard to these particular numbers in the story of the Exodus, there can be no mistake, and no uncertainty. There can be no *uncertainty*, because the number, 603,550, is checked in so many ways, by so many different statements,—especially by the statement of the amount of silver contributed for the Tabernacle,*—that there

* The *whole number* of the male Kohathites, as above given, 8,600, is more than *one-fourth as large again* as that of the Merarites, 6,200; whereas the converse is the case with the adults, since the number of Merarite males from *thirty to fifty years old*, 3,200, is just *one-sixth as large again* as that of the Kohathites, 2,750. Besides this palpable inconsistency, the Merarite males 'from thirty to fifty' are more than *half* the whole number of males of that family, 'from a month old and upward,' contrary to all the data of modern statistical science. It is obvious that, with all the *appearance* of extreme accuracy, there is no real *historical truth* in any of these numbers.

* Suppose it were stated on authority that

can be no doubt as to the number of warriors actually intended by the writer of the story. There can be no *mistake*—at least, if Moses wrote the story of the Exodus; because, we are told, he himself personally took a careful census of the people, the results of which, for each tribe, are set down exactly in N.i, repeated carefully in N.ii, and again, with variations, in N.xxvi.

195. It remains only to suppose that Moses did *not* write these chapters at all, (as we believe,) or did not write them *as they now stand*, so that these passages, and *all the others*, where these numbers are involved, have been *systematically and deliberately falsified in later days*, which would indicate that they were not regarded as so unspeakably sacred and divine, as to be secured from such 'free handling.' I confidently challenge investigation on this point; and I call upon any, who are prepared to maintain the possibility of the story being true, although these numbers may be wrong, not merely to suggest that the numbers *may* have to be reduced, but to point out *in what way* it is conceivable that they *can* be reduced, so as to get rid of the contradictions and impossibilities which they involve, without, at the same time, introducing other difficulties into the question, as grave as any which the numbers themselves occasion. Until this is done, I must assume that I have proved above that such a reduction is impossible, without sacrificing some of the most essential details of the story, and, in fact, its general historical character.

196. But the reasonings, adduced in Part I, are by no means *all* arithmetical, though they are all of a *practical* character.

Thus, for instance, it requires only the application of common sense, and no arithmetical calculation whatever,

the receipts at the International Exhibition for ten days, at a *shilling a head*, amounted to 39,177.10s., would any one doubt that it follows as a necessary consequence that the number of persons, who entered on those days at a shilling a head, was 603,550? This is exactly the inference to be drawn from E.xxviii.25-28.

to see that even a small body of men, women, and children, must have needed *water* during the long interval of nearly forty years between the miracles at Horeb, E.xvii, and Meribah, N.xx. They wanted also *firewood* for daily use, and must have certainly perished, if exposed to the bitter cold of the desert of Sinai during the severe winter months without such constant supplies of fuel, as were not to be obtained in that desolate waste. Further, their sheep and cattle, however few in number, must have needed *grass*, as well as *water*; and the rules for ensuring perfect cleanliness, by carrying out the refuse of the sacrifices, and all their rubbish, &c., to a place without the camp, would have been futile, if laid down for the population of an ordinary English town, as well as for a much greater multitude. Nor would a small body of such fugitives any more than a large one, have been able to carry *tents* with them; and it would have been just as impossible for ten poor men, as for ten thousand, to have supplied themselves easily with *pigeons* or *turtle-doves* under Sinai.

197. Once more, therefore, I repeat, it is vain to argue that the story is in the main correct and historically true, though marred by the mistake, so common among Eastern writers, of exaggerating, perhaps a hundredfold, the numbers of the people, and placing this large body under laws, and in circumstances, which were only possible for a small community. In fact, we have only to *realise* for once to our minds the idea of a city, as large and as populous as modern LONDON, set down, if that be conceivable or *possible*, in the midst of the Sinaitic waste,—and set down, not at one place only in that Desert, but at more than *forty different places*, N.xxxiii, if so many places can be imagined in the wilderness, where such a city could have been planted,—without any kind of drainage, with no supplies of water, for purposes of cooking or cleanliness, brought round, as in a modern town, by running streams or waterpipes to the neighbourhood, at least, of every house,—nay, with no supplies of water

at all, except on three special occasions, —with no supplies of fuel for warmth, during the frost and snow of forty winters,—even allowing that the miraculous ‘manna,’ together with the flesh of their flocks and herds, (which must have been supported, however, without water or pasturage), may have sufficed for all their wants as food, allowing also that they needed no *salt*, nor required fresh stores of raiment, for—

‘Their clothes waxed not old upon them, nor their shoes upon their feet,’ D.xxix.5—

—we have only, I repeat, once for all, deliberately to *face this question*, and to try to *realise to ourselves* such a state of things as this, and we shall see the utter impossibility of receiving any longer this story of the Exodus as literally and historically true, whatever real facts may lie at the basis of the narrative.

198. The one only cause, indeed, for astonishment is this—not that a Bishop of the Church of England should now be stating that impossibility—but that it should be stated now, by a Bishop of the Church, as far as I am aware, *for the first time*—that such a belief should have been so long acquiesced in by multitudes, both of the Clergy and the Laity, with an unquestioning, unreasoning, credulity,—that up to this very hour, in this enlightened age of free thought, in this highly-civilised land, so many persons of liberal education actually still receive this story in all its details—at least, in all its *main* details—as historical matter-of-fact, and insist on the paramount duty of believing in the account of the Exodus, among the ‘things necessary to salvation’ contained in the Bible, as essential to an orthodox faith in the True and Living God. Still more strange is it, and sad, that our Missionaries have been sent to teach in our name such a faith as this to the heathen, and to require them also, on the pain of eternal perdition, to believe that this history, in all its parts, with all its contradictions and impossibilities, has the seal of Divine Authority set upon it, as truly as those words, D.vi.5,—

‘Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might.’

199. Now, however, that we are able to feel that we stand on sure ground, when we assert that these books, whatever be their value, with whatever pious purpose they were written, and whatever excellent lessons they may teach, are not removed from the sphere of critical enquiry, by possessing any such Divine infallibility, as has been usually ascribed to them, there is a multitude of other difficulties, inconsistencies, and impossibilities, which will be at once apparent, if we examine carefully the Scripture narrative, and no longer suffer our eyes to be blinded, by the mere force of habit, to the actual meaning of the words which we read. Without, at present, stopping to consider those, which arise from examining the story of the Creation and the Fall, as given in the first chapters of Genesis, by the light of modern Science, we will here notice the contradictions, which exist between the first account of the Creation in G.i.1–ii.3, and the second account in G.ii.4–25.

200. Upon this latter passage I will quote the words of KALISCH (*Genesis*, p.83), one of the most able modern commentators on the Hebrew text of Genesis:—

The Creation was finished. We might imagine that we see the blooming meadows, the finny tribes of the sea, and the numberless beasts of the field, and, in the midst of all this beauty and life, man with his helpmate, as princes and sovereigns. But more: the Creation was not only finished; it had been approved of also in all its parts. And as the symbol of the perfect completion of His task, God was represented to rest, and to bless that day, which marked the conclusion of his labours.

But now the narrative seems not only to pause, but to go backward. The grand and powerful climax seems at once broken off, and a languid repetition appears to follow. Another cosmogony is introduced, which, to complete the perplexity, is, in many important features, in direct contradiction to the former.

It would be dishonesty to conceal these difficulties. It would be weakmindedness and cowardice. It would be flight, instead of combat. It would be an ignoble retreat, instead of victory. We confess there is an apparent dissonance.

201. The following are some of the more noticeable points of difference between the two cosmogonies, which we shall consider more at length hereafter.

(i) In the first, the earth emerges from the waters, and is, therefore, saturated with moisture, i.9,10.

In the second, the 'whole face of the ground' requires to be moistened, ii.6.

(ii) In the first, the birds and beasts are created before man, i.20,24,26.

In the second, man is created before the birds and beasts, ii.7,19.

(iii) In the first, man and woman are created *together*, as the closing and completing work of the whole Creation,—created also, as is evidently implied, in the same kind of way, to be the complement of one another; and, thus created, they are blessed together, i.28.

In the second, the beasts and birds are created *between* the man and the woman,—the man being made first, of the dust of the ground,—then the beasts and the birds, to which the man gives names,—and, after all this, the woman being made last, out of one of the man's ribs, but merely as a helpmate for the man. ii.7,8,15,22.

202. The fact is, that the *second* account of the Creation, ii.4–25, together with the story of the Fall, iii.1–24, is the work of a different writer altogether from him who wrote the *first*, i.1–ii.3.

The proof of this will be given in due time, as we proceed. But the fact itself is suggested at once by the circumstance that, throughout the first narrative, the Creator is always spoken of by the name ELOHIM, God; whereas, throughout the second account, as well as in the story of the Fall, He is always called JEHOVAH ELOHIM, LORD GOD, except in iii.1,3,5, where the writer seems to abstain, for some reason, from placing the name 'Jehovah' in the mouth of the Serpent.

This accounts naturally for the above contradictions. It seems that, by some means, the productions of two pens have been here united, without reference to their inconsistencies.

203. A similar contradiction exists also in the account of the Deluge, as it now stands in the Bible.

Thus in G.vi.19,20, we read:—

'Of every living thing of all flesh, *two* of every sort shalt thou bring into the Ark, to keep them alive with thee; they shall be male and female. Of *fowls* after their kind, and of cattle after their kind, of every creeping thing of the earth after his kind, *two* of every sort shall come unto thee, to keep them alive.'

But in G.vii.2,3, the command is given thus:—

'Of every clean beast thou shalt take to thee by *sevens*, the male and his female, and of beasts that are not clean by *two*, the male and his female; of *fowls*, also of the air by

sevens, the male and the female, to keep seed alive upon the face of all the earth.'

It is impossible to reconcile the contradiction here observed, in the numbers of living creatures to be taken into the Ark, especially in the case of the *fowls*, of which *one* pair of every kind is to be taken, according to the first direction, and *seven* pairs, according to the second.

204. But here also the matter explains itself easily, when we observe that the former passage is by the hand of that writer, who uses only ELOHIM, and the latter passage by the other writer, who uses JEHOVAH, as well as ELOHIM, though he does not now use the compound phrase, JEHOVAH ELOHIM. It did not occur to the one,—whether aware, or not, of the distinction between clean and unclean beasts,—to make any provision for sacrificing immediately after the Flood. The latter bethinks himself of the necessity of a sacrifice, G.viii.20, when Noah and his family come out of the Ark; and he provides, therefore, the mystical number of seven pairs of clean beasts and fowls for that purpose.

205. We shall produce hereafter the full proof of the above statement. For the present it will be sufficient to quote the following remarks of the Rev. J. J. S. PEROWNE, B.D., Vice-Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, and Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich, in SMITH'S *Dictionary of the Bible*, II.p.774–8.

If, without any theory casting its shadow upon us, and without any fear of consequences before our eyes, we read thoughtfully only the Book of Genesis, we can hardly escape the conviction, that it partakes of the nature of a compilation. It has, indeed, a unity of plan, a coherence of parts, a shapeliness and an order, which satisfy us that, as it stands, it is the creation of a single mind. But it bears also manifest traces of having been based upon an earlier work; and that earlier work itself seems to have had embedded in it fragments of still more ancient documents. . . .

At the very opening of the book, peculiarities of style and manner are discernible, which can scarcely escape the notice of a careful reader even of a translation,—which certainly are no sooner pointed out, than we are compelled to admit their existence. The language of chap.i.1–ii.3, (where the first chapter ought to have been made to end), is totally unlike that of the section which follows, ii.4–iii.23. This last is not only distinguished by a peculiar use of the Divine Names,—for here, and nowhere else in the whole Pentateuch, except

E.ix.30, have we the combination of the two, Jehovah-Elohim—[in other places we have such expressions as, 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Heaven,' Gen.xxiv.3,7, 'Jehovah, the Elohim of my master,' v.12,27,42,48, &c. but not 'Jehovah-Elohim' simply],—but also by a mode of expression peculiar to itself. It is also remarkable for preserving an account of the Creation, distinct from that contained in the first chapter. It may be said, indeed, that this account does not contradict the former [?], and might, therefore, have proceeded from the same pen. But, fully admitting that there is no contradiction, the representation is so different, that it is far more natural to conclude that it was derived from some other, though not antagonistic, source. . . . Still, in any case, it cannot be denied that this second account has the character of a *supplement*,—that it is designed, if not to correct, at least to explain, the other. And this fact taken in connection with the peculiarities of the phraseology, and the use of the Divine Names in the same section, is quite sufficient to justify the supposition, that we have here an instance, not of independent narrative, but of *compilation from different sources*. . . .

CHAPTER II.

THE ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC WRITERS.

206. It will be seen hereafter, when we proceed to examine critically the whole book of Genesis, that throughout the book the two different hands, which we have already detected, are distinctly visible; and the recognition of this fact will explain at once a number of strange and otherwise unaccountable contradictions and repetitions. One of these two writers, it will be found, is distinguished by the *constant* use of the word Elohim, the other by the intermixture with it of the name Jehovah, which two words appear as God and LORD, (not 'Lord,' *Adonai*.) in our English translation. Sometimes the latter writer uses *only* Jehovah as the Divine Name for considerable intervals, as the other uses only Elohim: thus, in i.1-ii.3 we have only Elohim, 35 times, in xxiv, only Jehovah, 19 times; and though in this latter chapter the word Elohim is used, it is not employed as the *Name* of the Deity, but He is described as 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Heaven,' v.3,7, 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Earth,' v.3, 'Jehovah, the Elohim of my master,' v.12,27,42,48.

207. Hence these two parts of the book are generally known as the Elohist and Jehovistic portions. And,

besides the peculiarity in the use of the Divine Name, there are, as might be expected, certain other marked differences in style and language, which are found to distinguish the two writers. Of these two documents, as Mr. PEROWNE observes, 'there can be no doubt that the Elohist is the earlier': and we shall show in Part IV. that the Elohist passages, which occur in the First Eleven Chapters of Genesis, form when put together, a complete, connected, whole. Whether the *Jehovistic* passages are also portions of an independent narrative, which have been extracted by some later compiler, and blended by him with the Elohist story, or whether the Jehovist himself, instead of writing a connected history, merely interpolated his own additions into the original work of the Elohist, is a question which must be reserved for further consideration at a more advanced stage of this work.

208. For the present we content ourselves with producing the following additional quotation from Mr. PEROWNE.

We come now to a more ample examination of the question, as to the distinctive use of the Divine Name. Is it a fact, as ASTRUC was the first to surmise, that this early portion of the Pentateuch, extending from G.1 to E.vi, does contain two original documents, characterised by their separate use of the Divine Names, and by other peculiarities of style? Of this there can be no reasonable doubt. We do find,—not only scattered verses, but—whole sections thus characterised. . . . And we find, moreover, that in connection with this use of the Divine Names, there is also a distinctive and characteristic phraseology. The style and idiom of the Jehovah sections is not the same as the style and idiom of the Elohim sections. . . . The alleged *design* in the use of the Divine Names will not bear a close examination. How, on the hypothesis of HENGSTENBERG, can we satisfactorily account for its being said in vi.22, 'Thus did Noah, according to all that God (*Elohim*) commanded him, so did he,' and in vii.5, 'and Noah did according to all that *Jehovah* commanded him,' while again, in vii.9, *Elohim* occurs in the same phrase? The elaborate ingenuity, by means of which HENGSTENBERG, DRECHSLER, and others, attempt to account for the specific use of the several names in these instances, is, in fact, its own refutation. The stern constraint of a theory could alone have suggested it. . . .

Still this phenomenon of the distinct use of the Divine Names would scarcely of itself prove the point, that there are two documents which form the groundwork of the existing Pentateuch. But there is other evidence pointing the same way:—

(i) We find, for instance, the same story told by the two writers, and their two accounts manifestly interwoven; and we find also certain favourite words and phrases, which distinguish the one writer from the other. . . .

(ii) But, again, we find that these duplicate narratives are characterised by peculiar modes of expression, and that, generally, the Elohist and Jehovistic sections have their own distinct and individual colouring.

209. It may be well here, before we proceed further, to insert a few quotations from Dr. KURTZ, which will show the gradual progress of an honest mind, in the investigation of the matter now before us, from the most decided orthodoxy at starting, to a very considerable change of opinion at the conclusion of his work.

I quote first from vol.i.p.56-65.

It is a historical fact, better established than any other in antiquarian research, that the Pentateuch is the basis and the necessary preliminary of all Old Testament history and literature, both of which—and with them Christianity as their fruit and perfection—would resemble a tree without roots, a river without a source, or a building which, instead of resting on a firm foundation, was suspended in the air, if the composition of the Pentateuch were relegated to a later period in Jewish history. The references to the Pentateuch, occurring in the history and literature of the Old Testament, are so numerous and comprehensive, and they bear on so many different points, that we cannot even rest satisfied with the admission, which BERTHEAU himself would readily make, that many portions of the present Pentateuch date, indeed, from the time of Moses, but were only collated and elaborated by a later editor. We go further, and maintain that the *whole Pentateuch*—its five books, and all the portions of which it is at present made up—is the basis and the necessary antecedent of the history of the Jewish people, commonwealth, religion, manners, and literature.

But this principle may be held in a narrower, and in a wider, acceptance of it. In the former case, the *whole Pentateuch*, as at present existing, is held to be from the pen of Moses,—of course, regarding the passage D.xxxii.48—xxxiv as a later addition and conclusion, written by a contemporary who survived Moses. In the latter case, it is thought that only certain portions of the Pentateuch had been written by Moses himself, and the rest by his contemporaries or survivors (collaborators or disciples), either at his own behest, and under his own superintendence, or, at least, in the same spirit, and that with them the sections and fragments, left by Moses himself, had been combined into one work. The latter opinion has of late been advocated by DELITZSCH; the former, (which is also the old one,) has latterly been set forth by HENGSTENBERG, RANKE, HÄVERNICK, DRECHSLER, WELTE, HERBST, SCHOLZ, KEIL, and the AUTHOR, in his 'Contribution towards proving and de-

fending the Unity of the Pentateuch,' and in his 'Unity of Genesis.' *The same view will be maintained and defended by the Author in the Introduction which is soon to appear.*

We have not indeed at any time concealed from ourselves or from others that, notwithstanding the able works of HENGSTENBERG, RANKE, DRECHSLER, and our own attempts, the argument, which upholds the original unity of Genesis, and of the Pentateuch, was not wholly free from difficulties. . . .

But, despite these difficulties, which at the time we knew we had not perfectly removed, we thought with a good conscience to maintain and defend the unity of Genesis.

210. Let us now see how KURTZ is obliged to modify his view, when he has reached the end of his work, iii.p.502-522.

We cannot conceal the fact that our examination of the middle books of the Pentateuch has brought us more and more to the conclusion, that *several authors have taken part in the composition of the Pentateuch.* . . .

In the *historical* portions of the Pentateuch, we must admit the existence of two distinct sources, which may be described as the 'groundwork' and the 'supplementary work.' Whether the groundwork consisted originally of historical matter only, or contained from the very outset the groups of laws in the central books,—whether it was written by the author who compiled the central groups of laws, or not,—these, and other questions of a similar character, we are utterly unable to determine. . . .

In addition to the fact, that it is not stated that the whole of the Pentateuch was written by Moses himself, but only a (considerable) portion of it, throughout those portions which are not so attested we constantly meet with *data*, which are apparently altogether irreconcilable with such a view. Notwithstanding all that HÄVERNICK, HENGSTENBERG, WELTE, and KEIL, have said to the contrary, (and what they have said is to a great extent very important and convincing), it appears to be indisputable, that, even apart from D.xxxiv, *there are portions of the Pentateuch which are post-Mosaic, or, at all events, Non-Mosaic*, though by far the largest part of what critics adduce does not come under this head at all.

211. It will be seen that Dr. KURTZ has been compelled, by a conscientious regard to the truth, to abandon a great part of the ground which he once maintained, and which is still maintained so strenuously by those who cling to the ordinary view. He still believes, however, that large portions of the Pentateuch were written down by Moses himself, and the 'groups of laws in the central books,' by the 'direction of Moses,' at all events, and 'under his supervision.' And, in fact, it has been argued, 'Admitting the

existence of the Elohist and Jehovistic documents of the book of Genesis, why may not Moses have had before him those narratives, which describe the patriarchal times before and after the Flood, handed down, perhaps, traditionally from a hoar antiquity, from Adam to Noah, from Shem to Abraham, &c. and at last, by some unknown hand, reduced to writing? And why may he not have combined them into one record, as we now find them in this book, as a preface to his own personal narrative, contained in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy?'

212. We reply as follows.

(i) These accounts in Genesis conflict with each other, as we have seen already in the case of the accounts of the Creation and the Deluge. Hence, even if Moses compiled the book of Genesis from documents already existing, he was not under *infallible* guidance in the selection of his materials.

(ii) The difference of style, &c. which shows a difference of authorship, is not confined to the book of Genesis, as we shall see, and as KURTZ himself implies, when he says that the examination of the *middle* books of the Pentateuch has 'compelled him more and more to the conclusion, that *several* authors have taken part in its composition.'

(iii) And, in fact, the phenomena, which we have considered in Part I, are irreconcilable with the notion that these middle books, from which they are all with one exception taken, can have been written by one sole author,—much less by Moses, or any contemporary of Moses, who had actually been concerned in the transactions described.

(iv) It is only thus that the character of Moses himself is relieved from the charges of absurd exaggerations and self-contradictions, which would otherwise be fastened upon him, if we were obliged to believe that he wrote every portion of the Pentateuch; whereas they are due to the circumstance, that in the Pentateuch we have a composite work, made up of different writings, of different persons in different ages, from which cause such contradictions would naturally and inevitably arise,—more especially when we take into account the difficulty of harmonising completely all parts of such a work, which would be caused by the mere material construction and other peculiarities of a roll of Hebrew manuscript.

CHAPTER III.

THE HISTORICAL BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

213. We must next endeavour to arrive at some clearer notion, from an examination of the books of the Pentateuch themselves, as to the time when,

the persons by whom, and the circumstances under which, they were most probably written. And, in pursuing our investigations, we need not now be restrained by any fear of trespassing upon divine and holy ground. The writers of these books, whatever pious intentions they may have had in composing them, cannot now be regarded as having been under such constant *infallible* supernatural guidance, as the traditionary doctrine of Scripture Inspiration supposes. We are at liberty, therefore, to draw such inferences from the matter which lies before us, and to make such conjectures, as we should be readily allowed to do, in a critical examination of any other ancient writings.

214. Here, then, first, it should be noted that the books of the Pentateuch are never ascribed to Moses in the inscriptions of Hebrew manuscripts, or in printed copies of the Hebrew Bible. Nor are they even styled the 'Books of Moses' in the Greek Septuagint or Latin Vulgate, but only in our modern translations, after the example of many eminent Fathers of the Church, who, with the exception of JEROME, and, perhaps, ORIGEN, were, one and all of them, very little acquainted with the Hebrew language, and still less with its criticism. But, in fact, these very titles, 'Books of Moses,' 'Book of Joshua,' may mean only 'Books *about* Moses and Joshua,' and do not at all imply that the Books in question were supposed to have been *written* by Moses and Joshua. We might as well infer from their titles that the 'Book of Judges' was written by the Judges, and the 'Book of Ruth' by Ruth.

215. Again, it is probable that the Pentateuch existed originally not as *five* books, but as *one*. Bishop TOMLINE writes:—

Though Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, stood as separate books in the private copies, used by the Jews in the time of Josephus, they were written by their author, Moses, in one continued work, and still remain in that form in the public copies read in the Jewish synagogues. It is not known when the division into five books took place. But, probably, it was first adopted in the Septuagint Version (B.C. 277), as the Titles, prefixed to the different books, are of Greek

derivation. The beginnings of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, are very abrupt, and plainly show that these books were formerly joined on to Genesis.

Notwithstanding the support given to the above conjecture, as to the time when the whole work was divided into five books, by the fact that each book is now called by a Greek name, there is reason for believing that the division may have been made at a much earlier date, when the Jews had returned from Babylon, and their Sacred Books were collected and set in order by Ezra about B.C. 450.

216. For we have an instance of similar quintuple division in the Psalms, which also consist of five books, each ending with a Doxology, xli.13, lxxii.18, lxxxix.52, cvi.48, cl.6, or, rather, the whole of Ps.cI may be regarded as a closing Doxology. Now, that the whole collection of Psalms, as it now stands,—or, rather, to the end of Book IV,—existed before the time of the composition of the Book of Chronicles, is indicated by the fact, that in 1Ch.xvi.7–36, we have a Psalm ascribed to David, which is evidently made up of portions of different Psalms of Book IV. This will appear plainly by comparing v.8–22 with Ps.cv.1–15, v.23–33 with Ps.xcvi, v.34 with Ps.cvi.1, v.35, 36, with Ps.cvi.47, 48, which last two verses are the Doxology at the end of Book IV, so that Book IV must then have been completed, and closed up as a separate collection. Hence it follows that, if the Book of Chronicles was composed, (as almost all Commentators of all classes maintain), at an age earlier than that of the LXX, this division of the Psalms must have existed previously to the Greek translation; and it is very possible that the quintuple division, both of the Psalms and of the Pentateuch, may have been made in the time of Ezra.

217. And, indeed, that something of importance was done by Ezra in *re-editing* and *copying* the Sacred Books, seems to be affirmed by a very strong tradition among the Jews, and especially by the curious apocryphal story in 2Esdr.xiv, to which JEROME and other

Fathers * seem to have attached some belief. Here Ezra is introduced as saying, v.21, 22,—

‘Thy law is burnt; therefore no man knoweth the things that are done of Thee, or the works that shall begin. But, if I have found grace before Thee, send the Holy Ghost into me, and I shall write all that hath been done in the world since the beginning, which were written in Thy Law, that men may find Thy path, and that they, which live in the latter days, may live.’

And Ezra says that his prayer was heard, and he received a command, to retire into a private place with five men, ‘ready to write swiftly,’ and ‘many box-tables to write upon.’

‘So I took the five men, as He commanded me, and we went into the field, and remained there. And the next day, behold, a voice called me, saying, Esdras, open thy month, and drink that I give thee to drink. Then opened I my mouth, and, behold, He reached me a full cup, which was full as it were with water, but the colour of it was like fire. And I took it, and drank; and, when I had drunk of it, my heart uttered understanding, and wisdom grew in my breast, for my spirit strengthened my memory; and my mouth was opened, and shut no more. The Highest gave understanding unto the five men, and they wrote the wonderful visions of the night that were told, which they knew not; and they sat forty days, and they wrote in the day, and at night they ate bread.’ v.37–42.

218. In the Pentateuch and book of Joshua we find recorded the history of mankind, with special reference to its bearing upon the Hebrew people, in one continuous narrative, with only one considerable break, (viz. of about 215 years (109) between the end of Genesis and the beginning of Exodus,) until the death of Joshua, after the Hebrew tribes were settled, according to the story, in the possession of the promised land of Canaan.

* ‘Whether you choose to say that Moses was the author of the Pentateuch or Esdras the renewer of that work, I have no objection.’ JER. *Hebr.* c.3.

The earlier Fathers, CLEMENS ALEX. and IRENÆUS speak yet more positively:—

‘And, when the Scriptures had been destroyed in the Captivity of Nebuchadnezzar, in the times of Artaxerxes the king of the Persians, Esdras the Levite the Priest, having become inspired, renewed again and produced prophetically all the ancient Scriptures.’ CLEM. ALEX. *Strom.* I. xxii. 149.

‘Then, in the time of Artaxerxes, the king of the Persians, He inspired Esdras the Priest of the tribe of Levi, to set in order again all the words of the former Prophets, and restore to the people the legislation by Moses.’ IREN. iii. 25.

The history of the people is continued in the books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings, through the reigns of the different kings, into the middle of the Babylonish Captivity, the last notice in the book of Kings being that 'in the seven and thirtieth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin, king of Judah,' that is, about twenty-seven years after the destruction of Jerusalem,—

'Evil-Merodach, the king of Babylon, in the year that he began to reign, did lift up the head of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, out of prison; and he spake kindly to him, and set his throne above the throne of the kings that were with him in Babylon, and changed his prison-garments; and he did eat bread continually before him *all the days of his life*. And his allowance was a continual allowance given him of the king, a daily rate for every day, *all the days of his life*.' 2K.xxv.27-30.

219. We have no occasion at present to consider more particularly the age of each of these books. It will be sufficient to observe that the last portion of the book of Kings must have been written, as the words italicised in the above text seem to indicate, *after* the death of Jehoiachin. But Evil-Merodach reigned but two years, and came to the throne B.C.561. Hence this portion must have been written after B.C.560, which date is twenty-eight years after the Captivity, B.C.588, and twenty-four years before the decree of Cyrus for the return of the Jews, B.C.536.

It is very possible, therefore, and, from the full details given in 2K.xxv, it seems not at all improbable, that this part of the story, and, perhaps, the account of the last two or three reigns, may have been written by an actual eye-witness, who had himself taken part in the proceedings, and shared in the sorrows, of the time.

220. The books of Chronicles, however, which, after giving a series of genealogical tables, go over much the same ground as the books of Samuel and Kings, and often in the very same words, were unquestionably written at a much later date. We may arrive at some certain conclusions, as to the time at which these books were written, from the following considerations.

(i) In 1Ch.iii.17-21 we have the following genealogy, Jeconiah, Assir,

Pedaiah, Zerubbabel, Hananiah, Pelatiah; so that this book was written *after the birth of Zerubbabel's grandson*, and Zerubbabel was the leader of the expedition, which returned to Jerusalem after the decree of Cyrus, B.C.536.

(ii) Again in 1Ch.xxix.7 we find the Persian coin, Daric, referred to familiarly, as if it had been long in use among the Jews. They 'gave for the service of the House of God five thousand talents and ten thousand *drams*, Heb. *darics*.' This coin, however, could not have been freely employed among the Jews till some time after its first introduction, which is supposed to have been in the reign of Darius Hystaspes, B.C.521-486. It appears, therefore, that the Jews must have been for some time under Persian government, before these books could have been written.

221. Hence there are many who ascribe the composition of the Chronicles to Ezra, who arrived at Jerusalem B.C.456. Thus TOMLINE writes:—

The books of Chronicles are generally, and with much probability, attributed to Ezra, whose book, which bears his name, is written with a similar style of expression, and appears to be a continuation of them.

Rather, the books of Chronicles are probably due to the very same hand, which wrote the two books of Ezra and Nehemiah. And the writer, from the special interest which he shows on all matters which concern the Levites, and from the great length at which he gives the genealogies of the Priestly and Levitical families, and, especially, of the Levitical *singers* of the time of David, was, in all probability, himself a Priest or Levite,—it would rather seem, a Levite *chorister*,*—who lived *after the time of Nehemiah*, B.C.409, or even, it may be, so late (223) as about B.C.332.

222. For our present purpose, how-

* The Chronicler treats of the Levitical *choristers* and *doorkeepers*, in the following passages, 1Ch.vi.16, &c. ix.14-29, xv.16-24, 27, 28, xvi.4-42, xxiii.5, xxv, xxvii.1, 12-19, 2Ch.v.12, &c. vii.6, viii.14, xx.19, 21, xxiii.4, 13, 18, &c. xxix.25-28, 30, xxx.21, &c. xxxi.2, 11-18, xxxiv.12, 13, xxxv.15. This array of passages indicates his partiality for these bodies, and (as an examination of them will show) especially for the former.

ever, it is sufficient to observe that the author of the book of Chronicles must have been, to all appearance, a *Priest* or *Levite*, who wrote *not before* B.C.400, *about two centuries after the Captivity*, B.C.588, and *six hundred and fifty years after David came to the throne*, B.C.1055.

This must be borne in mind, when we come to consider the peculiarities of this book, and the points in which the narrative differs from, and often contradicts, the facts recorded in the books of Samuel and Kings. We have already had occasion to point out some of its inaccuracies; and we shall see, as we proceed, further reason for believing that the Chronicler's statements, when not supported by other evidence, are *not certainly to be relied on*.

223. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah cannot, of course, have been written till after the transactions in which these eminent persons took so active a part. Ezra arrived at Jerusalem B.C.456, and Nehemiah's last act of reformation was in B.C.409. But in Neh.xii.11 we have given the genealogy of Jaddua, who was High-Priest in Alexander's time, B.C.332.

The book of Esther refers to events in the reign of Ahasuerus, supposed by some to have been the same Artaxerxes by whom Ezra was sent to Jerusalem, but more probably his father Xerxes, who reigned in Persia from B.C.486 to B.C.465, from which we see the *earliest* date at which this book could have been written.

CHAPTER IV.

SIGNS OF LATER DATE IN THE PENTATEUCH.

224. FROM the phenomena considered in Part I it is rather inferred, than proved, that the account of the Exodus, generally, as narrated in the Pentateuch, could not have been written by Moses, or by any one of his contemporaries. The following instances will tend to confirm the above conclusion, by showing plainly that large portions, at all events, of the Pentateuch, and with it, also, of the book of Joshua, were written at a much later date than the age of Moses and the Exodus.

225. (i) In E.xxx.13, xxxviii.24,25, 26, as already remarked, we have mention made of a 'shekel after the shekel of the Sanctuary,' or, as some render the words, a 'sacred shekel,' before there was, according to the story, any Sanctuary in existence, or any sacred system established in Israel. This appears to be an oversight,—as is also the command to sacrifice 'turtle-doves or young pigeons' in L.xiv.22, *with express reference to their life in the wilderness*,—arising from a writer in a later age employing inadvertently an expression, which was in common use in his own days, and forgetting the circumstances of the times which he was describing.

226. These passages show also plainly the unhistorical character of the narrative, since in the first and last of them the phrases in question are put into the mouth of Jehovah Himself. The story, therefore, could not have been written by Moses, or by one of his age, unless it be supposed that *such* a writer could be guilty of a deliberate intention to deceive. But it is quite conceivable that a pious writer of later days, (when the Tabernacle or the Temple was standing,) might have inserted such passages in a narrative already existing, which had been composed as a work of devout imagination, in the attempt to reproduce, from the floating legends of the time, the early history of the Hebrew tribes, for the instruction of an ignorant people.

227. (ii) '*And Jehovah turned a mighty strong west-wind which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red Sea.*' E.x.19.

For *west-wind* the original Hebrew of this passage has *wind of the sea*, that is, of course, the *Mediterranean* Sea, from which westerly winds blew over the land of *Canaan*, but not over *Egypt*. This expression, obviously, could not have been familiarly used in this way, till some time after the people were settled in the land of Canaan, when they would naturally employ the phrases, 'wind of the sea,' 'seaward,' to express 'west-wind,' 'westward,' 1K.vii.25, 1Ch.ix.24, 2Ch.iv.4, though they had also other ways of expressing the west, Jo.xxiii.4, 1Ch.xii.15, Is.xlv.6.

It is evident that neither Moses, nor one of his age, could have *invented* this form of expression, either while wandering in the wilderness, or even when, in the last year, according to the story, they had reached the borders of the promised land, and the Mediterranean lay then actually to the west of their position. Still less could he have used the phrase 'wind of the sea' to express a *westerly* wind, with reference to an event occurring in the land of Egypt, where the Mediterranean lay to the *north*, and the Red Sea to the *east*. And the same expression occurs in many other places of the Pentateuch, as G.xii.8, xiii.14, xxviii.14, E.xxvi.22, 27, xxvii.12, xxxvi.27, 32, N.ii.18, iii.23, xi.31, xxxiv.6, xxxv.5, D.i.7, iii.27, xxxiii.23.

228. It may, perhaps, be said that the Hebrews retained their own language, and their old forms of expression, after they went down to Egypt, and so used mechanically, as it were, the word 'sea' for 'west,' though so inappropriate. If this were the *only* difficulty to be met, such an explanation might be admitted. As it is, the phenomenon in question is but one of many like phenomena, very strongly suggestive of a later date of composition for those parts, at least, of the narrative in which they occur. So, for instance, in G.xli.6, 23, 27, the *east*-wind is spoken of as a *parching*-wind, which it certainly is in *Palestine*, but not in Egypt, where the east-wind is the most wholesome and refreshing breeze that blows, and the *west* and *south-west* winds are dreaded as *parching* winds.

229. (iii) '*Thou shalt put the blessing upon Mount Gerizim, and the curse upon Mount Ebal. Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the champaign over against Gilgal, beside the plains of Moreh?*' D.xi.29, 30.

These words are attributed to Moses. It must seem strange, however, that Moses, who had never been in the land of Canaan, should know all these places, and be able to describe them so accurately. But it is still more strange that he should know the name *Gilgal*, which, according to the book of Joshua, *was not given to the place till*

the people had been circumcised after entering the land of Canaan: *—

'And Jehovah said unto Joshua, This day have I rolled away the reproach of Egypt from off you. Wherefore the name of the place is called Gilgal unto this day.' Jo.v.9.

It is plain that the text in Deuteronomy was written at a later age, when these places and their names were familiarly known.

230. (iv) '*And pursued them unto Dan.*' G.xiv.14.

'*Jehovah showed him (Moses) all the land of Gilead unto Dan.*' D.xxxiv.1.

But the place was not named Dan till long after the time of Moses. For we read,—

'The coats of the children of Dan went out too little for them. Therefore the children of Dan went up to fight against Leshem, and took it, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and possessed it, and dwelt therein, and called *Leshem, Dan*, after the name of *Dan*, their father.' Jo.xix.47.

Further, in Ju.xviii we have the whole transaction detailed at length. And at the end it is added, v.29,

'And they called the name of the city, *Dan*, after the name of *Dan* their father; howbeit, the name of the city was *Laish* at the first.'

231. Now, as we are told in v.1 of this chapter, that these events took place when 'there was no king in Israel, and 'every man did that which was right in his own eyes,' xxi.25, they must have occurred, not only after the death of Moses, but after the death of Joshua. Hence the book of Joshua, of which the chapter, xix, from which the above quotation is made, is an integral portion, could not have been written by Joshua.

232. *A fortiori*, the narratives in Genesis and Deuteronomy, where references are made to this place, and where the name, *Dan*, occurs, not as the mere modern representative of an older name, (as 'Bela, which is Zoar,' 'the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea,' &c. G.xiv.2, 3,)—in which case it might have been explained as being possibly a note, inserted by a later writer—but as a substantial part of the very body of the story, cannot have been written by Moses, or by any contemporary of Moses.

* It has been said that the *Gilgal* mentioned in Deut.xi.30 must have been a different *Gilgal* from that which Joshua named. But see this theory examined at length and disproved in Part III. p.460-5.

233. KURTZ admits the force of this argument, and says, iii.p.522:

In i.p.216 I adopted HENGSTENBERG's explanation that the Dan of G.xiv.14 and D.xxxiv.1 was the same as the Dan-Jaan of 2S xxiv.6, and denoted a very different place from the ancient Laish. But a closer examination has convinced me that the very same Dan is alluded to in the Pentateuch and 2 Samuel, as in Jo.xix.47 and Ju.xviii.29.

234. (v) '*And these are the kings that reigned in the land of Edom, before there reigned any king over the children of Israel.*' G.xxxvi.31.

The phrase, 'before there reigned any king over the children of Israel,' is here used in such a way as to imply that *one* king, at least, had reigned, or was reigning, over 'the children of Israel.'—that is, apparently, not over one of the separate kingdoms of Judah or Israel, but over the *united people*,—at the time when it was written. In other words, it could not have been written *before* the time of SAMUEL.

235. (vi) '*Beforetime in Israel, when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, 'Come and let us go to the Seer'; for he, that is now called a Prophet (Nabi), was beforetime called a Seer (Roeh).*' 1S.ix.9.

This being the case, it is remarkable that, throughout the Pentateuch and the books of Joshua and Judges, the word *Roeh* is never once used, but always *Nabi*. From this it follows that those portions of these books, which contain this later word,—as G.xx 7, E.vii.1, xv.20, N.xi.29, xii.6, D.xiii.1,3,5, xviii.15,18,20,22, xxxiv.10, Ju.iv.4,vi.8,—can hardly have been written before the days of Samuel. In that age the word *Nabi* may have been known, and employed by some, though *Roeh* was, it seems, the word in popular use. But in still older times, as those of Moses and Joshua, we should expect to find *Roeh* generally employed, and certainly *not Nabi exclusively*. Nay, in 2S.xv.27, we read, 'The king said also unto Zadok the Priest, Art not thou a Seer (Roeh)?' Hence we may infer that the word *Roeh* was in use, at all events, till the latter part of David's reign, though, it would seem, no longer *exclusively*, as in the older time, since *Nabi* was the word now commonly employed.

236. (vii) '*And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged them-*

selves upon their enemies. Is not this written in the book of Jasher?' Jo.x.13.

First, it would be very strange that, if Joshua really wrote this book, he should have referred for the details of such an extraordinary miracle, in which he himself was primarily and personally concerned, to another book, as the book of Jasher. But in 2S.i.18 we read,—

'Also he (David) bade them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow, (or 'teach it,' that is, the song in question, 'thoroughly to the children of Israel,' EWALD). Behold, it is written in the book of Jasher.'

Here, then, we have a fact in the life of David recorded in this same 'book of Jasher.' The natural inference is, that this 'book of Jasher,'—which probably means the 'book of the righteous,' that is, of Israel or Jeshurun, the righteous one, the 'righteous people, that keepeth the truth,' and contained a number of notable passages in their history,—was written not earlier than the time of DAVID, and the above passage in the book of Joshua was written, of course, after that.

237. (viii) '*For Arnon is the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites; wherefore it is said in the Book of the Wars of Jehovah,*

'What he did in the Red Sea,
And in the brooks of Arnon,
And at the stream of the brooks,
That goeth down to the dwelling of Ar,
And lieth upon the border of Moab.'

N.xxi.13-15.

Clearly this passage could not have been written by Moses or by one of his contemporaries. A writer of that age would not have stated in this way a fact,—'Arnon is the border of Moab, between Moab and the Amorites,'—which must have been notorious to those for whom he was writing. Nor would he have used this statement, to illustrate the words of a song, which could only by any possibility have just been composed, since it refers to events which had happened, according to the story, *only a week or so before* (162). In fact, the language of the song itself implies that the transactions at the 'brooks of Arnon,' as well as at the Red Sea, were *long past*. And, consequently, the 'Book of the Wars of Jehovah,' which contained this song, must have been written long after the days of Moses.

238. (ix) 'See, he hath brought in an Hebrew unto us to mock us.' G.xxxix.14.

'The Hebrew servant, which thou hast brought unto us.' G.xxxix.17.

'For indeed I was stolen away out of the land of the Hebrews.' G.xl.15.

'There was with us a young man, an Hebrew.' G.xli.12.

In the above passages, the word 'Hebrew' is used in a familiar way, as if it were a well-known appellation of a whole people,—well-known even in Egypt,—nay, as if the land of Canaan could really be spoken of by Joseph, as the 'land of the Hebrews,' so as to be readily understood by the Egyptians with whom he was speaking. It seems plain that here also expressions, which were current in a later age, have been allowed inadvertently to slip into the narrative.

239. (x) So also, in Deuteronomy, transactions, in which Moses himself was concerned, are detailed at full length, as by one referring to events *long past*, when, according to the story, only a very short time could by any possibility have elapsed since they took place, and, therefore, all the circumstances must have been quite fresh in the memory of those, to whom Moses is supposed to be speaking. See D.i,ii,iii, and especially such a passage as the following.

'And we took all his cities at that time; there was not a city, which we took not from them, threescore cities, all the region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan. All these cities were fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, beside unwall'd towns, a great many. And we utterly destroyed them, as we did unto Sihon, king of Heshbon, utterly destroying the men, women, and children, of every city. But all the cattle, and the spoil of the cities, we took to ourselves. And we took at that time, out of the hand of the two kings of the Amorites, the land that was on this side [on the other side] Jordan, from the river of Arnon unto Mount Hermon,—which Hermon the Sidonians call Sirion, and the Amorites call it Shenir,—all the cities of the plain, and all Gilead, and all Bashan, unto Salchah and Edrei, cities of the kingdom of Og in Bashan. For only Og, king of Bashan, remained of the remnant of the giants; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; *is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon?* nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man.' D.iii.4-11.

Now we have already seen (162) that only a week or two at the outside could have elapsed since the time when these

transactions, according to the story, took place. Even if they had happened within the last few years, Moses could hardly have spoken of them as events of a bygone time in this way. But, with an interval only of a few days, when they had hardly yet breathed from the conflict, it seems impossible that he should have thus addressed them.

240. Thus it is obvious that large portions of the Pentateuch, including the account of the Exodus itself, (see E.x.19, where the word 'sea' is used for 'west'), must have been composed long after the times of Moses and Joshua.

Further, it cannot be supposed that any later writers would have presumed to mix up, *without distinction*, large and important sections of history of their own composition, with writings so venerable and sacred, as any must have been, which had been handed down from the time of Moses,—still less, if they were really *believed* to have been written by his hand, and, chiefly, *from the very mouth of Jehovah Himself*. It is hardly conceivable that any pious Israelite, much less a Prophet or Priest, would have dared to commit an act of such profanity, under any circumstances. But, certainly, we must believe, he could not have done so, without distinguishing in some way the Divine words, as written down by Moses, from his own.

241. There is not, however, a single instance of any such distinction being drawn throughout the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; though in one or two places of Deuteronomy, xxxi.30, xxxiii.1, xxxiv, the expressions imply that a later writer is professedly setting forth the words or acts of Moses. And many of the signs of a later date, which we have just been considering, occur in passages, which must, if any, have been written by Moses himself, recording the words which Jehovah had spoken to him. We are compelled, therefore, it would seem, to the conclusion, that the later writer or writers did *not* believe in the unspeakably sacred character of any older docu-

ments, which may have come down to them,—that they did *not* receive them, as really written by the hand of Moses, and conveying, on his own authority, the astonishing facts of his awful communion with God.

242. While, therefore, it is possible, as far as we know at present, that laws, songs, &c., may be included in the Pentateuch, which are of very ancient date, and may have even been handed down from the times of Moses, we can scarcely suppose that even these were actually written by his hand, any more than we can believe that the whole story of the Exodus, containing, as we have seen, such strange contradictions, could have had Moses for its author. In short, without anticipating here the result of closer enquiry, observing only that the instances above adduced occur in so many different places as to cover, so to speak, the whole ground of the Mosaic story, we are warranted already in asserting that the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, *generally*, must have been composed in a later age than that of Moses and Joshua, and some parts of them, at all events, not earlier than the time of Samuel (234) or of David (236).

CHAPTER V.

ADDITIONAL SIGNS OF LATER DATE IN THE PENTATEUCH.

243. BESIDES those already produced, however, there are a number of minor indications, all pointing to the same result; though, perhaps, if they stood alone, an ingenious criticism might dispose of some of them, by suggesting that glosses of later writers may have crept in by accident, or may, possibly, have been designedly interpolated in the original text.

244. We may notice, for instance, the frequent occurrence of the expression 'unto this day,' in places where it could have had no meaning, unless the 'day' referred to was considerably later than the time of Moses or Joshua.

'Jair, the son of Manasseh, took all the country of Argob unto the coasts of Geshuri and Maachathi, and called them after his own name Bashan-Havoth-Jair, *unto this day.*' D.iii.14.

But this took place after the conquest of

Bashan, v.13, and, therefore, could only have happened (162) a few days before the death of Moses.

'No man knoweth of his (Moses's) sepulchre *unto this day.*' D.xxxiv.6.

'And Joshua set up twelve stones in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the feet of the Priests, which bare the Ark of the Covenant, stood; and *they are there unto this day.*' Jo.iv.9.

'Wherefore the name of the place is called Gilgal *unto this day.*' Jo.v.9.

'And they raised over him a great heap of stones *unto this day.* . . . Wherefore the name of that place was called the valley of Achor, *unto this day.*' Jo.vii.26.

'And Joshua burnt Ai, and made it a heap for ever, even a desolation *unto this day.*' Jo.viii.28. So viii.29,x.27.

'And Joshua made them that day hewers of wood and drawers of water for the Congregation, and for the Altar of Jehovah, *even unto this day, in the place which He should choose.*' Jo.ix.27.

'Nevertheless, the children of Israel expelled not the Geshurites nor the Maachathites; but the Geshurites and the Maachathites dwell among the Israelites *unto this day.*' Jo.xiii.13. So xv.63,xvi.10.

'Hebron, therefore, became the inheritance of Caleb, the son of Jephunneh, the Kenezite, *unto this day.*' Jo.xiv.14.

245. There are other passages in the Pentateuch, in which the phrase 'unto this day' occurs, as G.xix.37,38, xxii.14, xxvi.33, xxxii.32, xxxv.20, xlvii.26, D.ii.22, x.8, where, however, the phrase might have been used even by a writer of the age of Moses, as the events referred to were either ancient in his days, or, in the case of D.x.8, (which refers to the separation of the Levites for religious offices,) had taken place, according to the story, nearly forty years before.

246. Again, such expressions as the following indicate a later date than that of Moses.

'And the Canaanite *was then in the land.*' G.xii.6.

'And the Canaanite and Perizzite *dwell then in the land.*' G.xiii.7.

These words seem to imply that, at the time when they were written, the Canaanite was no longer dwelling in the land, as its owner and lord.

247. 'And when the inhabitants of the land, the Canaanites, saw the mourning in the floor of Atad, they said, This is a grievous mourning to the Egyptians. Wherefore the name of it was called Abel-Mizraim, which is *beyond Jordan.*' G.i.11.

The story in G.1.7-11 seems to intimate that Joseph came with the funeral train

of his father to the 'threshing-floor of Atad, which is beyond Jordan,' v.10, where 'he made a mourning for his father for seven days;' after which, Joseph and his brethren 'carried into the land of Canaan' the corpse of their father, and buried it 'in the cave of the field of Machpelah,' while the *Egyptians* still remained on the other side of the river. If so, the use of the phrase 'beyond Jordan' would imply a writer who lived in the land of Canaan.

But the remark made above holds good, at all events, of the other passages, in which the same expression, 'beyond,' 'on the other side,' occurs.

'These be the words, which Moses spake unto all Israel on the other side (the E.V. has here, erroneously, 'on this side') Jordan, in the wilderness.' D.i.1.

'On the other side Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law.' D.i.5.

248. On this point BLEEK writes as follows, p.205:—

These words could only have been written by one who found himself on this side Jordan, and, therefore, after the death of Moses and the possession of the land of Canaan. Some translate the expression 'on this side Jordan'; but this the usage of the Hebrew tongue will not allow. One might rather say that the above formula was a *standing designation* for the country east of Jordan, which might be used in this sense without any regard to the position of the writer. So it is often employed in later times,—[even as we ourselves employ it in the present day, when speaking, as it were, from the stand-point of the Hebrews in Canaan, we talk of the 'trans-Jordanic land.'] But it is most probable that this phrase first formed itself among the Hebrews after they were settled in Canaan, and the greater part of them on the west of Jordan. In that case, Moses, or a writer of his age, would not have expressed himself about it in this way, so long as he himself was on the eastern bank. In Deuteronomy this use of the expression is the less likely, since frequently, in the words of Moses, the phrase is used distinctly for the land of Canaan, west of Jordan, that is, on the other side from the stand-point of the speaker, iii.20,25, xl.30; although it also stands in a speech of Moses for the eastern side, iii.8, and so too in the history itself, iv.41,46,47,49. If, however, Moses himself had been the writer, who found himself on the eastern side, he would certainly only have used the expression of the land west of Jordan, the land of Canaan.

249. Thus, for example, the expression 'Transalpine Gaul' might have been used by a Roman writer—when that term had become the recognised description of that part of Gaul, which lay on the other side of the Alps with

reference to the city of Rome,—whether he lived on the North, or the South, of the Alps. But it could not have been so used, by a person living North of the Alps, for the country lying North of the Alps, until the phrase had come into common use, and, *à fortiori*, not until Rome itself had been built, to which the reference is made.

250. 'And the children of Israel did eat manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan.' E.xvi.35.

This verse could not have been written till after they had ceased eating manna, which, we are told, took place 'on the morrow after they had eaten of the old corn of the land' Jo.v.12.

251. 'That the land spue not you out also, when ye defile it, as it spued out the nations which were before you.' L.viii.28.

This implies that the Canaanites were already exterminated, when these words were written.

252. 'And, while the children of Israel were in the wilderness, they found a man that gathered sticks upon the sabbath-day.' N.xv.32.

This, according to its natural interpretation, would seem to have been written when the people were no longer in the wilderness, that is, it could not have been written by Moses.

253. 'The Horims also dwell in Seir before-time; but the children of Esau succeeded them, when they had destroyed them from before them, and dwell in their stead; as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which Jehovah gave unto them.' D.ii.12.

These words are a mere parenthetical interruption of the narrative. But, in the time of Moses, Israel had not done this unto the land of Canaan, which, surely,—and not the country on the other side of the Jordan,—is meant by the 'land of his possession,' as is indicated distinctly in D.iv.1,—

'Now, therefore, hearken, O Israel, that ye may live, and go in, and possess the land, which Jehovah the God of your fathers giveth you.'

254. 'Which Hermon the Sidonians call Sirion, and the Amorites call it Shenir.' D.iii.9.

In David's time, and afterwards, the Sidonians were well known to the people of Israel. But what could they have known of them in the days of Moses, that such a note as this should have been inserted in the middle of a speech of the great lawgiver?

255. 'For only Og, king of Bashan, remained of the remnant of the giants; behold! his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbath of the children of Ammon? Nine cubits (16½ feet) was the length thereof, and four cubits (7½ feet) the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man.' D.iii.11.

But only a very short time, according to the story (162), could have elapsed since the conquest of Og. How, then, could his 'bedstead' have been removed in that interval to Rabbath-Ammon? There was not one of his people left alive, D.iii.3, to bear off in safety this cumbersome relic of their lord. Or how could Moses, so soon after the event, have spoken of Og at all in such terms as these?

256. It may be said, indeed, that it was not captured by the Israelites with the other spoils of Og, but had been taken to Rabbath-Ammon *before* the death of Og,—perhaps, captured by the Ammonites in some former war, or, perhaps, sent by Og himself for preservation. The first of these suppositions, however, is hardly consistent with the fact that Og, at the time of his overthrow by the Israelites, is said to have had his 'threescore cities, all fenced with high walls, gates, and bars, beside unwall'd towns a great many,' D.iii.5; and, as to the second, it is very unlikely that an 'iron bedstead' of this kind should have been deemed by Og himself so valuable a treasure, as to have been sent to the Ammonites for safe-keeping on the approach of the Israelites. In fact, it was most probably a stone coffin, made of the dark basalt of the district.

257. Again, names of places are often used familiarly, which could scarcely have been known to Moses, much less to the Israelites generally, at the time of the Exodus, some of which, indeed, are modern names, which, according to the story itself, did not even exist in the time of Moses.

'Then Abram removed his tent, and came and dwelt in the plain of Mamre, which is in Hebron.' G.xiii.18.

Yet in Jo.xiv.15, xv.13, we are informed that the name of this city, till its conquest by Caleb in the days of Joshua, was *Kirjath-Arba*. It is said plainly in Jo.xiv.15, 'The name of the

city *before* was Kirjath-Arba;' so that Moses could not have known the name 'Hebron.'

'And he removed from thence unto a mountain on the east of Bethel, and pitched his tent, having Bethel on the west, and Hai on the east.' G.xii.8.

The familiar use of the name Bethel in this passage, and in G.xiii.3, in the story of Abraham's life,—a name which was not given to the place till Jacob's day, G.xxviii.19,—betrays the later hand of one, who wrote when the place was spoken of naturally by this name, as a well-known town.

'And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, even as the garden of Jehovah, like the land of Egypt, *as thou comest unto Zoar.*' G.xiii.10.

This is supposed to have been written for the instruction, in the first instance, of the Hebrews in the wilderness. But what could they have known of the nature of the country in the land of Canaan, 'as thou comest unto Zoar,' G.xix.22?

258. Sometimes, the modern name of a town or place is given, as well as the ancient one.

'And Sarah died in Kirjath-Arba; the same is Hebron, in the land of Canaan.' G.xiii.2.
'Ephrath, which is Bethlehem,' G.xxv.19,
'Kirjath-Arba, which is Hebron,' v.27.

'Bela, which is Zoar,' G.xiv.2, 'the vale of Siddim, which is the Salt Sea,' v.3, 'En-Mishpat, which is Kadesh,' v.7, 'the valley of Shaveh, which is the king's dale,' v.17.

259. The 'king,' who is referred to in the above expression, 'king's dale,' *may* have been Melchizedek, or some other of the ancient kings of Canaan. But it seems more probable that the expression points to king David, who was the first to make Jerusalem the seat of government for the children of Israel. And so we read, 2S.xviii.18,—

'Absalom, in his lifetime, had taken and reared up for himself a pillar, which is in the *king's dale.*'

He would be most likely to have done this near the royal city. Accordingly, JOSEPHUS writes, *Ant.* VII. x. 3:—

Now Absalom had erected for himself a marble pillar in the king's dale, two furlongs distant from Jerusalem, which he named Absalom's Hand.

This also would accord with his statement that 'Melchizedek, king of Salem,' came out to the 'valley of Shaveh,' to meet Abraham. For it can

scarcely be doubted that Salem here means Jerusalem, as in Ps.lxxvi.2, 'In Salem also is His Tabernacle.' And it is noticeable that the name *Melchizedek*, 'king of righteousness,' means the same as *Adonizedek*, 'lord of righteousness,' who is spoken of in Jo.x, as having been king of Jerusalem in Joshua's time. And so JOSEPHUS understands it, *Ant.I.x.2*.

If this view be correct, then the use of the word Salem also, occurring in the substance of the main story, would indicate a writer living in later times; since the Canaanitish name of the city was Jebus, Jo.xviii.28, Ju.xix.10,11, and there can be little doubt that the name Jerusalem, 'possession of peace,' was first given to it by David, after its capture by him from the Jebusites. 2S.v.6-9.

260. 'Now an *omer* is a tenth part of an ephah.' E.xvi.36.

These words imply that, at the time when they were written, the '*omer*' had gone out of use, and was not likely to be known to the ordinary reader. In fact, this word, '*omer*,' is found nowhere else in the Bible as the name of a measure. The '*homer*,' which contained ten ephahs, Ez.xlv.11, and, therefore, a hundred '*omers*,' E.xvi.36, was quite another vessel.

261. So, too, in Deuteronomy, there are little pieces of information given, about the ancient history of the land of Canaan, which we cannot conceive to have been spoken or written down by Moses, but must ascribe to the pen of a later archæologist.

'There are eleven days' journey from Horeb, by the way of Mount Seir, unto Kadesh-Barnea.' D.i.2.

One glance at the connection, in which this verse stands, will show that it is simply a note of distance, which interrupts awkwardly the course of the narrative, and never certainly could have been introduced by Moses himself into the story.

262. Again we have the following notices of a similar kind.

'And Jehovah said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle. For I will not give thee of their land for a possession; because I have given Ar unto

the children of Lot for a possession. *The Emims dwell therein in times past, a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakims; which also were accounted giants, as the Anakims; but the Moabites call them Emims. The Horims also dwell in Seir beforetime; but the children of Esau succeeded them.*' D.ii.9-12.

'I will not give thee of the land of the children of Ammon any possession; because I have given it unto the children of Lot for a possession. *That also was accounted a land of giants; giants dwell therein in old time; and the Ammonites called them Zamzummims, a people many, and great, and tall, as the Anakims; but Jehovah destroyed them before them; and they succeeded them, and dwell in their stead; as He did to the children of Esau, which dwell in Seir, when He destroyed the Horims from before them; and they succeeded them and dwell in their stead, even unto this day: and the Avims, which dwell in Hazerim, even unto Azzah, the Caphtorims, which came out of Caphtor, destroyed them, and dwell in their stead.*' D.ii.19-23.

263. Here the Rev. THOS. SCOTT says:—

These fragments of ancient history were introduced to encourage the Israelites. If the Lord destroyed these gigantic people before the posterity of Lot and of Esau—what cause had the posterity of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, his chosen servants and friends, to fear the Anakims or the Canaanites?—especially as Israel acted by commission from God, and had His promise as their security of success, and the pledge of it in His Presence, and the wonders which He had already wrought for them, and as they were the only nation of worshippers of the Lord, in the ordinances of His institution, which could be found on earth.

It will be plain, however, to an unprejudiced reader that this is *not* the special reason, for which these notices of ancient times are introduced. They occur only as pieces of interesting information on the points in question, without a word to intimate that they are expressly meant for the encouragement of the people.

264. It is generally admitted that D.xxxiv, which relates the death and burial of Moses, and contains the statements,—

'but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day,' v.6,

'and there arose not a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses,' v.10—

must have been written by a later hand. But so, too, the 'Blessing of Moses,' contained in D.xxxiii, bears on its very face unmistakable signs of having been inserted, at all events,—if not originally composed,—by a later writer. For we read,—

'This is the blessing, wherewith *Moses, the man of God*, blessed the children of Israel before his death,' v.1.

And the expressions here used, 'Moses, the man of God,' and 'before his death,' are sufficient to satisfy us, unless we have recourse to some forced interpretation, that this 'Blessing,' even if originally composed and spoken by Moses, could not have been inserted by himself into the narrative.

265. Also such passages as the following could hardly have been written by Moses himself:—

'Moreover, the man Moses was very great in the land of Egypt, in the sight of Pharaoh's servants, and in the sight of his people.' E.xi.3.

'Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth.' N.xii.3.

'These are that Aaron and Moses, to whom Jehovah said, Bring out the children of Israel from the land of Egypt according to their armies. These are they which spake to Pharaoh, king of Egypt, to bring out the children of Israel from Egypt: these are that Moses and Aaron.' E.vi.26,27.

'And, if ye have erred and not observed all these commandments, which Jehovah hath spoken unto Moses, even all that Jehovah hath commanded you by the hand of Moses, from the day that Jehovah commanded Moses, and henceforward among your generations,' &c. N.xv.22,23.

It can scarcely be doubted that such statements as the above must have been written by some one, who lived in an age after that of Moses.

CHAP. VI.

REPETITIONS IN THE PENTATEUCH.

266. AGAIN, there are several instances in the Pentateuch of identical repetitions of the same or very similar incidents, such as could never have been recorded by one and the same hand in an original work. Thus we have the following:—

G.xxviii.18,19.

'And Jacob rose up early in the morning, and took the stone that he had put for his pillows, and set it up for a pillar, and poured oil upon the top of it. And he called the name of that place Bethel; but the name of that city was called Luz at the first.'

G.xxxv.14,15.

And Jacob set up a pillar at the place where He talked with him, a pillar of stone, and he poured a drink-offering thereon, and he poured oil thereon. And Jacob called the name of the place where God spake with him Bethel.

Thus we have two different accounts

of the origin of the name 'Bethel,' and the second incident is dated, according to the story, twenty years after the first.

267. And here it cannot be said that, on the second occasion, Jacob merely *revived* the name, which he had given to the place twenty years before; for the latter passage plainly implies that Jacob then gave the name for the first time to the place where God spake with him. And, besides, in G.xxxv.1,3,—a passage very probably due to the same author as G.xxviii.18,19,—the place is treated as already familiarly known to Jacob, and to his household (!), as 'Bethel': nay, in xxxv.7, we read—

'And he built there an altar, and called the place El-Bethel, because there God appeared to him, when he fled from the face of his brother'—

as recorded in xxviii.18,19; whereas afterwards we read, v.15,—

'And Jacob called the name of the place, where God spake with him, Bethel.'

268. G.xxxii.27,28.

'And he said unto him, what is thy name? and he said, Jacob. And he said, Thy name shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel, for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed.'

G.xxxv.9,10.

'And God appeared unto Jacob again, when he came out of Padan-aram and blessed him. And God said unto him, Thy name shall not be called any more Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name: and He called his name Israel.'

Here, likewise, we have two different accounts of the origin of the name Israel. The second distinctly says that God 'called Jacob's name Israel' at a *later* period than that referred to in the former passage, where the name is also said to have been given to him by the mysterious person who 'wrestled' with him: and in xxxiii.20, we find Jacob himself using the name—

'And he erected there an altar, and called it El-Elohe-Israel,'—

not to speak of xxxiv.7, where we read—

'They were very wroth, because he had wrought folly in Israel,' &c.

where the use of the word might be accounted for by the *writer* using an expression, which was familiar in the age in which he himself lived.

269. Again, in G.xii.10-20, we have an account of Abram's going into Egypt because of a famine,—of his persuading his wife Sarah to call herself his 'sister,' because he dreaded the consequences of her beauty,—of Pharaoh's taking her into his harem, being 'plagued,' &c., and at length dismissing him honourably.

But in G.xx.1-18, we have almost identically the same account though detailed at greater length, of a similar visit paid by Abraham to Abimelech, the king of Gerar, about thirty years afterwards. Abraham shows the same weakness, v.2,11,13, and, to save his own life, exposes his wife, though pregnant with the long-desired child, xvii.21,xviii.14, to the same danger as before; Sarah, though now 'well stricken in age,' xviii.11, 'ninety years old,' xvii.17, is taken into the harem of Abimelech, v.2, as before into that of Pharaoh: Abimelech is visited with dreams, v.3,6, and is plagued, v.17,18, and finally dismisses Abraham with honour, v.16.

And then, once more, in G.xxvi. 6-11, we have a very similar story told of Isaac and Rebekah. Isaac goes to Abimelech, king of Gerar, because of a famine:—

'And the men of the place asked him of his wife, and he said, She is my sister; for he feared to say, She is my wife, 'lest the men of the place should kill me for Rebekah:' for she was fair to look upon.'

Abimelech, however, discovers accidentally that Rebekah is Isaac's wife, and prevents any mischief, v.10; and Isaac thrives in the land of Gerar, v.13,14.

270. In like manner, we have in E.xvi an account of the miracle of the *quails*, which are here spoken of as given at the same time with the *manna*, v.12,13, after murmurings of the people, v.2,3, at the *beginning* of the forty years' wanderings. But in N.xi we have a very similar account of a miracle of quails, at the *end* of the forty years' wanderings; and, that this is not regarded by the writer as a *second* miracle, a *repetition* of the former, is shown by the language ascribed to Moses, which implies that he had no idea how the people could be supplied

with 'flesh,' and had therefore not witnessed the former miracle. Thus he says, v.13,—

'Whence should I have flesh to give unto all this people? for they weep unto me, saying, Give us flesh, that we may eat?'

And when Jehovah himself had promised to supply them, v.16-20,—

'Therefore Jehovah will give you flesh, and ye shall eat: ye shall not eat one day, nor two days, nor five days, neither ten days, nor twenty days, but even a whole month, until it come out at your nostrils, and it be loathsome unto you,'—

Moses distrusts altogether the possibility of this, and says, v.21,22,—

'The people among whom I am, are six hundred thousand footmen; and thou hast said, I will give them flesh, that they may eat a whole month. Shall the flocks and the herds be slain for them to suffice them? or shall all the fish of the sea be gathered together for them to suffice them?'

The writer in this case could hardly have ascribed such words to Moses, if he had supposed him to have already witnessed the former miracle, under very similar circumstances, when, in reply to the murmurings of the people, nearly forty years before,—

'At even the quails came up and covered the camp.' E.xvi.13.

271. So, again, there are two accounts of the 'smiting of the rock' for water, and of the giving to the place the name 'Meribah,'—one at the beginning, and the other at the end, of the forty years' wanderings.

E.xvii.1-7.

'And all the congregation of the children of Israel journeyed from the wilderness of Sin, after their journeys, according to the commandment of Jehovah, and pitched in Rephidim; and there was no water for the people to drink. Wherefore the people strove with Moses, and said, Give us water that we may drink. And Moses said unto them, Why strive ye with me? Wherefore do ye tempt Jehovah? And the people thirsted there for water; and the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore is this that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst? And Moses cried unto Jehovah, saying, What shall I do unto the people? They be almost ready to stone me. And Jehovah said unto Moses, Go on before the people, and take with thee of the elders of Israel, and thy rod, wherewith thou smotest the river, take it in thine hand, and go. Behold! I will stand before thee there upon the rock in Horeb: and thou shalt smite the rock, and there shall come water out of it, that the people may drink. And Moses did so in the sight of the elders of Israel.

And he called the name of the place Massah (temptation) and Meribah (strife), because of the striving of the children of Israel, and because they tempted Jehovah, saying, Is Jehovah among us, or not ?'

N.xx.1-13.

'And the children of Israel, the whole congregation, came into the wilderness of Sin in the first month, and the people abode in Kadesh. . . . And there was no water for the congregation. And the people strove with Moses, and spake saying, Would God that we had died when our brethren died before Jehovah! And why have ye brought up the congregation of Jehovah into this wilderness, that we and our cattle should die there? And wherefore have ye made us to come out of Egypt, to bring us unto this evil place? It is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates; neither is there any water to drink. . . . And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Take the rod, and gather thou the assembly together, thou, and Aaron, thy brother, and speak ye unto the rock before their eyes, and it shall give forth its water, and thou shalt bring forth to them water out of the rock; so shalt thou give the congregation and their beasts drink. And Moses took the rod from before Jehovah, as He commanded him. And Moses and Aaron gathered the congregation together before this rock, and he said unto them, Hear now, ye rebels! must we fetch you water out of the rock? And Moses lifted up his hand, and with his rod he smote the rock twice, and the water came out abundantly, and the congregation drank and their beasts also. . . . This is the water of Meribah, because the children of Israel strove with Jehovah, and He was sanctified in them.

In the first of the above accounts, the 'rod' is the 'rod of Moses,' with which he 'smote the river,' E.xvii.5, and did such wonders in Egypt: in the second, it is the 'rod of Aaron,' which was 'laid up before Jehovah,' N.xvii.7,10, and which Moses was commanded to 'take from before Jehovah.' But the statements in E.xvii.7, N.xx.13, which explain the origin of the name 'Meribah,' show plainly that the two accounts—probably by different writers—refer to one and the same transaction.

272. Again, in the narrative of E.xix-xxiv, as it now stands, there is great confusion, in consequence, no doubt, of some interference with the original story.

(i) In xix.9, the last words of v.8 are repeated—

'and Moses told the words of the people unto Jehovah'—

in a connection where they can have no possible meaning, since no 'words of

the people' are recorded after the corresponding statement in v.8, that 'Moses returned the words of the people unto Jehovah.' It may be that some words have been omitted, which would explain the matter.

(ii) In v.22,24, are mentioned 'the Priests, which come near to Jehovah,' when as yet there were no Priests, according to the story.

(iii) In v.20 Moses is summoned to 'come up to the top' of Sinai, an operation thus described by BURCKHARDT, *Conder's Arabia*, p.153-4:—

'After ascending for about *twenty-five minutes*, we breathed a short time under a large impending rock, close by which is a small well of water, as cold as ice. At the end of *three quarters of an hour's* steep ascent, we came to a small plain. According to the Koran and Moslem traditions, it was in this part of the mountain, which is called *Djebel Oreb*, or *Horeb*, that Moses communicated with Jehovah. From hence a still steeper ascent of *half an hour* leads to the summit.'

(iv) But no sooner has he reached the summit, after all this labour, than he is commanded to go down again, v.21,22, with a message to the people; and though he himself seems to object to take it, or, at least,—somewhat irreverently, as it appears to us,—reminds Jehovah of His own previous command, which rendered it needless to do so, v.23, yet he is ordered to go down,—

'Away! get thee down! and thou shalt come up, thou and Aaron with thee. So Moses went down unto the people, and spake unto them,' v.24,25.

(v) Then, most abruptly, without any introduction, and *without any notice of his going up with Aaron*, the 'Ten Commandments are delivered,' xx.1-17.

(vi) We must suppose, therefore, that he has not ascended, but is standing with the terrified people below, v.18-20.

(vii) Then, when the people 'removed and stood afar off,' Moses, we are told, 'drew near to the thick darkness, where God was,' v.21, and Jehovah delivered laws to Moses, xx.22-xxiii.33.

(viii) Hence Jehovah spake with Moses *at the foot* of the Mount. For what purpose, then, was Moses summoned to the *top* of the Mount in xx.20? Was it only to be sent down

at once with the message as in xix. 21, 22?

(ix) Immediately at the close of the laws thus delivered, we read, xxiv. 1—

'And he said unto Moses, Come up unto Jehovah, thou, and Aaron, Nadab, and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel.'

(x) But what now has become of the command in xix. 24?—

'Come up, thou, and Aaron with thee: but let not the *Priests* and the *people* break through to come up to Jehovah, lest He break forth upon them.'

It is plain that in this verse Aaron is meant to come up *alone* with Moses: and, in fact, Nadab, Abihu, and the seventy elders, are by the express words of this very command *forbidden* to 'come up unto Jehovah,' whether we reckon the two sons of Aaron among the 'priests' of that time or among the 'people.'

(xi) However, the account proceeds in xxiv. 9–11:—

'Then went up Moses and Aaron, Nadab and Abihu, and seventy of the elders of Israel; and they saw the God of Israel; and there was under His feet, as it were, a paved work of a sapphire stone, and as it were the body of heaven in its clearness. And upon the nobles of the children of Israel He laid not his hand; also they saw God, and did eat and drink.'

(xii) But then follows another command to Moses, v. 12,—

'Come up to me into the Mount, and be there; and I will give thee tables of stone and the law, and the commandments which I have written, that thou mayest teach them.'

But Moses had already 'gone up,' v. 9, and was now *on* the Mount, in the place where he and Aaron, Nadab, &c. had 'seen God.' We may suppose that this was not the *top* of the Mount, and that Moses was to go up *higher*.

(xiii) Then Moses and Joshua 'went up into the Mount of God,' v. 13, charging the elders thus, v. 14:—

'Tarry ye here for us, until we come again unto you; and behold, Aaron and Hur are with you; if any man have any matters to do, let him come unto them.'

But where were the elders at this time? *On* the Mount, at all events, if not on the *top* of it—in the place where they had 'seen God'; they had not *gone down*, for then Moses would not have said, 'Tarry ye here for us, until we come again.' Were the people, then, who were not to dare even to *draw near* the Mount, to go up to Aaron and Hur

with all their cases—if not for the *forty* days of Moses' absence, which (it may be said) he had not anticipated, yet at least for the day on which he charged them to 'tarry here' for him?

(xiv) But *Joshua* also 'went up' with Moses, v. 13, and *remained with him all the forty days*, for he came down with him at the end of them, xxxii. 17. How then was Joshua occupied during all this time? Did he also fast forty days and forty nights, 'neither eating bread nor drinking water'—an act which is noted as so remarkable in Moses, xxxiv. 28, but which is seldom spoken of in connection with his 'minister,' Joshua?

It is easy to see that the original narrative has been disturbed by interpolations: thus xxiv. 1, 2 seem plainly to be inserted between the laws in xx. 22—xxiii, and xxiv. 3–8, and xxiv. 9–11 seems properly to follow after xxiv. 2.

CHAPTER VII.

WAS SAMUEL THE ELOHISTIC WRITER OF THE PENTATEUCH?

273. Thus in all these different ways we have a corroboration of the results, to which we had already arrived on quite other grounds, viz. that the Pentateuch is the work of more than one hand, and that considerable portions of it, at all events, must have been written at a time later than the age of Moses or Joshua.

But, if so, there is no one indicated in the whole history, *before* the time of SAMUEL, who could be supposed to have written any part of it. We have no sign of any other great Prophet in that age, except Deborah, nor of any 'School of the Prophets' existing before his time.

274. That Samuel *did* occupy himself with historical labours we read in 1 Ch. xxix. 29,—

'Now the acts of David the king, first and last, behold they are written in the Book of Samuel the Seer, and in the Book of Nathan the Prophet, and in the Book of Gad the Seer.'

This, however, is from the pen of the Chronicler, and, from the experience which we have already had of the in-

accuracy of his data (107-8), we cannot rely upon his statements, when unsupported by other evidence. And, in point of fact, very little of David's life, and none whatever of 'the acts of David as king,' could possibly have been written by Samuel, since he died three years after anointing David, and five years before the time when David came to the throne of Israel.

275. It has been suggested, however, that the terms, 'Book of Samuel,' 'Book of Nathan,' &c. may only be meant to apply to certain portions of the present books of Samuel, viz. those in which the respective Prophets play a somewhat conspicuous part, and shade, as it were, the historical ground with their presence. Thus the 'Book of Samuel' may be 1S.i.1-xxv.1, and the 'Book of Nathan' may be the middle part of the narrative, 2S.vii, together with the sections before and after, i.e. 1S.xxv.2-2S.xxiii, and the 'Book of Gad' may be 2S.xxiv. This supposition is very plausible, and certainly not to be hastily rejected. But the 'acts of David, first and last,' are not contained in the two books of Samuel, but are carried on in 1K.i.ii; and in the first of these two chapters *Nathan* is very prominent, so that we should have to consider this also as a part of the 'Book of Nathan.'

276. If, however, we adhere to the more usual notion, that by these three 'Books' of Samuel, Nathan, and Gad, are meant books either written or supposed to have been written, by the Prophets whose names they bear, then, in this mention by the Chronicler of the 'Book of Samuel the Seer,' we should have a sign of the activity of Samuel in this direction. Either the Chronicler might have actually seen the Book in question, or, at least, a vivid tradition might have come down to him of the Seer's historical labours in the olden time, six or seven centuries before his own. This may also seem to be confirmed by that other fact recorded about him in 1S.x.25, viz. that, on the election of Saul to the royal dignity,—

'Samuel told the people the manner of the kingdom, and wrote it in a Book, and laid it before Jehovah.'

277. And, certainly, it is very conceivable that, when he gave up to Saul the reins of government, and, during the last thirty-five years of his life,—more especially, during the last twenty years, when he 'came no more to see Saul,' but lived retired from public life, presiding over the school of the Prophets at Ramah, where at one time he had David staying with him, 1S.xix.18-24. (see also 1S.x.5,6.)—he may have devoted himself to such labours as these, for the instruction and advancement of his people.

278. And so, TUCH observes, *Genesis*, p.xciii, where, after recapitulating the 'signs of time,' which he finds in the Elohist document, he states his conclusion as follows:—

It is, consequently, the first fruit of the progress, out of the condition of religious and political indifference, to a settled state of order and regulated social life, which the people made chiefly through the activity of SAMUEL. . . . Who the writer may have been cannot [? with certainty] be conjectured. We might imagine SAMUEL, and consider the primary document to be the last service which he, withdrawn from public occupations in the evening of his life, rendered to his people rescued by his activity.

279. In such a work as this, Samuel may have been aided by the 'sons of the Prophets,' who clearly must have had some sort of occupation, besides that of merely 'prophesying,' i.e. probably, chanting psalms,—see 1Ch.xxv.1, where we read of—

'the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun, who should prophesy with harps, with psalteries, and with cymbals,—

and joining in religious processions, as in 1S.x.5. They could not have been engaged in the study of the Scriptures, as in a modern theological Institution, when such Scriptures, even those of the Pentateuch, did not exist,—at least, in their present form. It is very possible that Samuel may have gathered in these 'Schools' some of the more promising young men of his time, and may have endeavoured to train them, to the best of his power, in such knowledge of every kind as he himself had acquired,—among the rest, it may be, the art of writing, lately learned from the Phœnicians.

280. In short, these 'Schools' may have resembled somewhat a modern

'college,' where the old Seer and Patriot sought to impart, as he best could, the rudiments, at least, of 'sound learning and religious education,' in advance of the general spirit of the rough age in which he lived, to a class of choice youths, such as Nathan and Gad. For *their* use, in the first instance, he may have composed,—from whatever resources he had at his command,—from the traditions of the people, or, it may be, as far as we know at present, even with the help of written documents handed down from an earlier time,—some account of the early history of Israel, as BEDE wrote that of the Anglo-Saxons.

281. It is, indeed, (it may be said,) a rare combination for the same person to be an historian, and, at the same time, a great political character. Yet we have seen such instances even in our own days. And from 1S.viii it would almost seem that Samuel was not, perhaps, a first-rate politician; and in the latter part of his life, at all events, he displayed less personal activity, and was not wholly successful in his government. It is possible, in fact, that, at the time when his sons, set up by himself as judges in Beersheba,—

'turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment,' 1S.viii.3,—

Samuel may have been too closely engaged, and his attention too much absorbed, in such matters as these, to correct such disorders. Among his pupils, probably, as we have just said, were Nathan and Gad themselves, who thus may have had their first lessons in the writing of history.

282. Hitherto we had been advancing upon *certain* ground. It seemed to follow as a necessary conclusion, from the facts which we had already had before us, (i) that the account of the Exodus, generally, is not historically true, (ii) that it is the work of more than one writer, (iii) that it must have been written,—at least, a great part of it,—in a later age than that of Moses.

But we are now entering on the field of conjecture. And, though it will be seen that there are some reasons, which seem to warrant us in ascribing

the primary Elohist document, the *groundwork* of these books, to the *age*, and, therefore, also to the *hand*, of Samuel, yet this is a question merely of probability, and our views in this respect may be shewn to be erroneous, and be set aside by a more sagacious criticism, without at all affecting the positive results, to which we have already arrived. For myself, at all events, it would be a sinful shutting of my eyes to the plain light of Truth, if I ventured any longer to maintain the usual opinion, as to the origin and composition of the Pentateuch.

283. Prof. RAWLINSON expresses his view of the composition of the Pentateuch, as follows, *Aids to Faith*, p.251:—

(i) It is not intended to assert that Moses was the original composer of all the documents contained in his volume. The Book of Genesis bears marks of being to some extent a compilation. Moses probably possessed a number of records, some of greater, some of less, antiquity, whereof, under Divine guidance, he made use in writing the history of mankind up to his own time. It is possible that the Book of Genesis may have been, even mainly, composed in this way from ancient narratives, registers, biographies, in part the property of the Hebrew race, in part a possession common to that race with others. Moses, guided by God's Spirit, would choose among such documents those which were *historically true*, and which bore on the religious history of the human race. He would not be bound slavishly to follow, much less to transcribe, them, but would curtail, expand, adorn, complete, them, and so make them thoroughly his own, infusing into them the religious tone of his own mind, and at the same time rewriting them in his own language. Thus it would seem that Genesis was produced. With regard to the remainder of his history, he would have no occasion to use the labours of others, but would write from his own knowledge.

(ii) It is not intended to deny that the Pentateuch may have undergone an authoritative revision by Ezra, when the language may have been to some extent modernised, and a certain number of parenthetical insertions may have been made into the text. And this authoritative revision would account at once for the language not being more archaic than it is, and for the occasional insertion of parentheses of the nature of a comment. It would also explain the occurrence of 'Chaldaisms' in the text.

(iii) It is, of course, not intended to include in the Pentateuch the last chapter of Deuteronomy, which was evidently added after Moses's death, probably by the writer of the Book of Joshua.

284. The above view, we must sup-

pose has the deliberate sanction of the Editor of 'Aids to Faith,' the present Archbishop (THOMSON) of York. It is needless to observe how very much even this differs from the traditional view as to the composition of the Pentateuch. The idea of Ezra undertaking to revise, in a later age, words believed to have been written down by Moses, and to have been uttered by Jehovah Himself, — of his modernising language so venerable and sacred, — must surely seem very strange to many an English reader.

285. The following admissions are made in another work, 'The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuch considered, &c. by a Layman, *dedicated by permission* to the Archbishop of York,' in addition to those which have been already quoted from this work in the Preface to Part I, People's Edition, p. 21.

So far as the latter part of the Book of Numbers is concerned, the order of laws and narrative is regular and accurate enough, although the two are everywhere perfectly distinct, and easily separable. In the former part, however, considerable confusion exists; and not only are laws and narrative irregularly disposed, but even different sections of the latter transposed in the most unaccountable manner. . . . All that we wish to point out is the striking contrast between this part of the history and that immediately preceding, recorded in the Book of Exodus, as a proof that they must have proceeded from different authors, and that the latter is, so far as its narrative is concerned, most certainly un-Mosaic, p. 147-8.

We are certainly not warranted in supposing that the Book [of Deuteronomy] in its present form is to be ascribed to Moses' pen. It contains the account of his death, which (as already remarked) we cannot, without the most extravagant and unjustifiable assumptions, regard as written by himself. Some part of the narrative, then, is clearly due to another hand; and, as there is no appearance of this being a later addition, the same is probably the case with all the narrative sections. p. 156.

286. As the attention of the Archbishop of York had been distinctly called, both privately and publicly, by one of the Clergy of his Province, to these and similar extracts from the book in question, long before he withdrew his patronage from it, it must, I presume, be inferred that His Grace deliberately allowed the circulation of these statements under the authority of his name. Whatever may be thought of the sound-

ness of the above conclusions, (which, probably, a more close and deep study of the subject will materially modify,) yet at all events the ordinary English reader has here sufficient evidence of the general nature of the results, to which a serious examination of the facts will inevitably lead any candid and truth-seeking enquirer, — as, indeed, we have seen already in the case of Dr. KURTZ and Mr. PEROWNE. But after the above examples of the consequences of applying a searching and honest criticism to the contents of the Pentateuch, with the most devout intention of maintaining as far as possible the traditional views of the Origin and Authority of the Pentateuch, it is obvious that a work, such as that in which we are now engaged, so far from deserving censure and refutation at the hands of theologians, is laid upon us as a primary necessity of the present age, and as a positive duty.

CHAPTER VIII.

INTRODUCTION OF THE NAME JEHOVAH.

287. In the story of the Exodus we read as follows:—

'And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am JEHOVAH. And I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, by the Name of God Almighty (EL SHADDAI); but by my Name JEHOVAH was I not known to them. And I have also established my covenant with them, to give them the land of Canaan, the land of their pilgrimage, wherein they were strangers. And I have also heard the groaning of the children of Israel, whom the Egyptians keep in bondage; and I have remembered my covenant. Wherefore say unto the children of Israel, I am JEHOVAH. And I will bring you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians, and I will rid you out of their bondage, and I will redeem you with a stretched-out arm and with great judgments. And I will take you to me for a people, and I will be to you a God. And ye shall know that I am JEHOVAH your God, which bringeth you out from under the burdens of the Egyptians. And I will bring you in unto the land, concerning the which I did swear to give it, to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob; and I will give it to you for an heritage. I am JEHOVAH.' E. vi. 2-8.

288. The above passage cannot, without a distortion of its obvious meaning,—the meaning which would be ascribed to it by the great body of simple-minded readers, who have never had their attention awakened to the

difficulties, in which the whole narrative becomes involved thereby,—be explained to say anything else than this, that the Name, Jehovah, was not known at all to the Patriarchs, but was now for the first time revealed, as the name by which the God of Israel would be henceforth distinguished from all other Gods.

So Prof. LEE admits, who in his Hebrew Lexicon explains Jehovah to be—the most sacred and unalienable name of God, unknown, however, to the Patriarchs: *it is not, therefore, more ancient in all probability than the time of Moses.*

And so says JOSEPHUS, *Ant. II. xii. 4.*—Wherefore God declared to him (Moses) His holy Name, which had never been discovered to men before.

289. But then we come at once upon the contradictory fact, that the name, Jehovah, is repeatedly used in the earlier parts of the story, throughout the whole book of Genesis. And it is not merely employed by the writer, when relating simply, as an historian, in his own person, events of a more ancient date, in which case he might be supposed to have introduced the word, as having become, in his own day, after having been thus revealed, familiar to himself and his readers; but it is put into the mouth of the patriarchs themselves, as Abraham, xiv. 22, Isaac, xxvi. 22, Jacob, xxviii. 16.

290. Nay, according to the story, it was not only known to these, but to a multitude of others,—to Eve, iv. 1, and Lamech, v. 29, before the Flood, and to Noah, after it, ix. 26,—to Sarai, xvi. 2, Rebekah, xxvii. 7, Leah, xxix. 35, Rachel, xxx. 24,—to Laban also, xxiv. 31, Bethuel, xxiv. 50, 51, and Abraham's servant, xxiv. 27,—even to *heathens*, as Abimelech, the Philistine king of Gerar, his friend, and his chief captain, xxvi. 28, 29. And, generally, we are told that, as early as the time of Enos, the son of Seth, iv. 26,—

'Then began men to call upon the Name of Jehovah.'

But the name was already known to Eve, according to the narrative, iv. 1, more than two centuries before.

291. The recognition of the plain meaning of E. vi. 2–8, such as that quoted above from Prof. LEE, (a writer of undoubted orthodoxy,) would be

enough at once to decide the question as to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. If the Name was 'not more ancient than the time of Moses,' then Moses himself, in writing the story of the ancient Patriarchs, would surely not have put the Name into their mouths,—much less into those of heathen men,—nor could he have found it so ascribed to them in an *older* document. Prof. LEE's view, therefore, would require us to suppose that, if Moses wrote the main story of the Exodus, and of his own awful communications with God, as well as the *Elohistic* portions of Genesis, yet some other writer must have inserted the *Jehovistic* passages. But then it can hardly be believed that any other writer should have dared to mix up, without any distinction, his own additions with a narrative so venerable and sacred, as one which had actually been written by the hand of Moses. The interpolator must have known that the older document was *not* written by Moses, and had no such sacred character attached to it.

292. The ordinary mode of 'reconciling' these discrepancies is exhibited in the following passage from Dr. KURTZ, ii. p. 101:—

It is not expressly said that the Name, Jehovah, was *unknown* before the time of Moses, but merely that, in the patriarchal age, God had not revealed the fulness and depths of His Nature, to which that Name particularly belonged.

But this is, evidently, an assumption made only to get over a difficulty. If Abraham made use of the Name Jehovah at all, then God *was* known to him in some measure—in some sense or other—by that Name, if not known so perfectly as by the Israelites in later days. If the Patriarchs employed the Name at all, it could scarcely have been said,—

'I appeared unto them by the Name, El Shaddai; but by my Name, Jehovah, was I *not* known to them,' E. vi. 3.

293. And, surely, we cannot doubt of this, when we read such words as these:—

'Abram *believed in Jehovah*, and He counted it to him for righteousness. And He said unto him, I am Jehovah, that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees, to give thee this land to inherit it.' G. xv. 6, 7.

'I am Jehovah, the God of Abraham thy father, and the God of Isaac: the land, whereon thou liest, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed, &c. And Jacob vowed a vow, saying, If God will be with me, &c. *then shall Jehovah be my God.*' G.xxviii.13-21.

'O God of my father Abraham, and God of my father Isaac, Jehovah, which saidst unto me, &c.' G.xxxii.9.

Could Abram have *'believed in Jehovah,'* and God Himself have declared this Name to Abram, saying, 'I am Jehovah, that brought thee out of Ur of the Chaldees,' and yet Abram after all be said not to 'know God' by this Name? Could Jacob have said, 'Jehovah shall be my God,' if God was 'not known' to him by the name Jehovah? And what is the meaning of Abraham's servant repeatedly speaking of 'Jehovah,' as 'the God of his master Abraham'? G.xxiv.12, 27, 42, 48.

294. Like the other contradictions, however, which appear in the accounts of the Creation and the Deluge, the whole is easily explained, when we know that different writers were concerned in composing the narrative of the book of Genesis. The Jehovist, as we have seen, uses the name Jehovah habitually in G.ii.4-iv.26. The Elohist, as has been said, never uses the name Jehovah at all, throughout the book of Genesis, even when narrating facts of history: much less does he allow it to be uttered by any one of the personages, whose story he is telling.

295. We have, for instance, the Elohist passage, G.xlvi.2, 3,—

'And Israel took his journey with all that he had, and came to Beersheba, and offered sacrifices unto the Elohim of his father Isaac. And Elohim spake unto Israel in the visions of the night, and said, 'Jacob, Jacob.' And he said, 'Here am I.' And He said, 'I am Elohim, the Elohim of thy father.'

Comp. this with the Jehovistic, xxviii. 13:—

'And, behold, Jehovah stood above it, and said, 'I am Jehovah, the Elohim of Abraham thy father, and the Elohim of Isaac.'

So, again, in G.xlviii, where Jacob blesses Manasseh and Ephraim, and especially in v.15, 16, where he accumulates, as it were, Divine titles,—

'Elohim, before whom my fathers, Abraham and Isaac, did walk, Elohim, which fed me all my life long unto this day, the Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads;—

and where the writer could hardly

have failed to have put the word Jehovah in the patriarch's mouth, if he had supposed it known to him, it does not once occur.

296. Further, in different parts of the book of Genesis, a multitude of names occurs, many of which are compounded with the Divine Name in the form *El*; whereas there is not a single one compounded with the Name JEHOVAH, in the form either of the prefix *Jeho* or *Jo*, or the termination *Jah*, both of which were so commonly employed in later times. Thus there are thirteen names in G.v, sixteen in G.xi.10-32, fifteen in G.xxii.20-24, thirty-three in G.xxv.1-15, seventy in G.xlvi, in all one hundred and forty-seven names; and in the last of these passages we have *Israel*, *Jemuel*, *Jahleel*, *Malchiel*, *Jahzeel*; but *in not a single instance is any of these names compounded with the word Jehovah.*

297. Again, in N.i.5-15, among twenty-four new names, there are nine compounded with *Elohim*,—*Elizur*, *Shelumiel*, *Nethaneel*, *Eliab*, *Elishama*, *Gamaliel*, *Pagiel*, *Eliasaph*, *Deuel*,—*not one with Jehovah*. Again, in the list of spies, N.xiii.4-15, out of twenty-four other new names, four are compounded with *Elohim*,—*Gaddiel*, *Amiel*, *Michael*, *Geuel*,—*none with Jehovah*. And in the list of those, who are to divide the land by lot, N.xxxiv. 19-28, we have seven other names compounded with *El*,—*Shemuel*, *Eliadad*, *Hanniel*, *Kemuel*, *Elizaphan*, *Paltiel*, *Pedahel*,—*none with Jehovah*. Also in Jo.xv we have six names of towns compounded with *El*,—*Jabneel*, *Kabzeel*, *Jokteel*, *Jezreel*, *Eltoled*, *Eltekon*,—besides the man, *Othniel*, but *not one with Jehovah*.

298. Some of the passages just quoted are, undoubtedly, Elohist; others may be, and in fact, as we shall see hereafter, are, most probably, Jehovistic. But, however this may be, the argument derived from them is decisive against the historical veracity of those portions of Genesis, which represent the name Jehovah as being all along as familiar in the mouths of men, even of heathen men, as *Elohim*.

299. But they seem to do more than this. They suggest also that *even in the time of the Jehovahist*, if he lived in a later age than the Elohist, the word Jehovah was *not in very common use* among the people, so as to be frequently employed in the composition of the names of their children. Otherwise, as he has introduced this Divine Name so freely from the first in his narrative, without apparently perceiving the incongruity which he was committing, we might expect that he would have just as inadvertently have introduced, here and there, such names as were common in his own time, compounded with Jehovah.

300. The above is said, assuming that it has been already sufficiently shown that there is no reason to suppose that the details of the story of the Exodus, including the lists of names, &c., are historically true. Otherwise, it might, of course, be argued that the very fact, that no such Jehovistic names occur in the whole narrative, is itself a strong indication of the truthfulness and historical reality of the record.

301. But since no such names, of course, would be formed till the age of Moses, if the name was then first revealed, how can the *absence* of such names be reconciled with the statement that in the time of Enos, men 'began to call upon the name of Jehovah,' or with the perfect familiarity with that name, which, according to the Jehovistic portions of Genesis, existed in all ages? If so many names were formed, before the time of Moses, compounded with *El*, how is it that not one, throughout the whole book of Genesis, is compounded with *Jehovah*, on the supposition that this Name was known and used so freely from the first? In fact, if only *one* such name, *e.g.* Jochebed, really existed in the age *before* Moses, it is obvious that it would only have been a type of a multitude of others, which must have been in use in those days, but of which we find no sign in the Pentateuch.

302. As it is, there are only *two* names of persons throughout the whole Pentateuch and book of Joshua, which are compounded with Jehovah, *viz.*

that of *Joshua* himself, (of whom we find it expressly recorded, N.xiii.16, that Moses changed his name from Oshea to Jehoshua), and, probably, that of *Jochebed*, the mother of Moses. But the very fact of the occurrence of this latter name, as a solitary instance of the forms so common in later days being used in these early times, is itself a very strong indication that the passages in which it occurs, E.vi.20, N.xxvi.59, may be later interpolations. For the present it is enough to say that it seems very strange that, if the names of the father and mother of Moses were known to the writer of the account of his birth in E.ii, they should not have been there mentioned at the first, instead of its being stated quite vaguely,—

'There went a man of the house of Levi, and took to wife a daughter of Levi.'

303. Very different is the result, however, if we examine the Chronicles, and quite in consistency with what we have observed already of the character of this book. Here we find *Azariah*, 1Ch.ii.8, in the *third* generation from Judah. Nay, the wife of Judah's grandson, Hezron, who went down with Jacob into Egypt, is *Abiah*, ii.24, and Hezron's grandson is *Ahijah*, ii.25, and Judah's grandson is *Reuiah*, iv.2, and another of his early descendants is *Jonathan*, ii.32. So Issachar's grandson is *Rephaiah*, vii.2, and his great-grandson, *Izrahiah*, and his sons, *Obadiah*, *Joel*, *Ishiah*, v.3; and Benjamin's grandson is *Abiah*, v.8; and among the early descendants of Levi are *Joel*, xxiii.8, *Rehabiah*, v.17, *Jeriah* and *Amariah*, v.19, and *Jesiah*, v.20, the first cousins of Moses, *Jesiah's* son *Zechariah*, xxiv.25, and *Jaaziah*, v.27; and we have actually *Bithiah*, the daughter of Pharaoh, iv.18, apparently the Egyptian king. So among the ancestors of Samuel himself are *Joel*, *Azariah*, *Zephaniah*, vi.36, which, however, appear as *Shaul*, *Uzziah*, *Uriel*, in v.24; and among those of Asaph and Ethan, David's contemporaries, are seven others, whose names are compounded with Jehovah.

304. In short, such names abounded in these early days, according to the

Chronicler, from the age of Jacob's great-grandchildren downwards, just as freely as in later days. *Before* that age no such names are given even by the Chronicler; while, among the hundreds of names mentioned in the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, down to the time of the Conquest of Canaan, there are only two names of this kind, Joshua and Jochebed. It is scarcely possible to doubt that the Chronicler has simply *invented* these names. He has, apparently, copied the earlier names from the Pentateuch itself, down to the age of Jacob's grandsons, and a few of their children. But there, it would seem, his authority failed him, and for the rest he had to draw upon his own resources; and, accordingly, he has inserted many names compounded with Jehovah, which were familiar to himself in later days.

305. In fact, the argument obviously stands thus. Either the Name, Jehovah, *was* first revealed, according to the story, in the time of Moses, or it was known long before that age, from the very first,—from the time of Eve, G.iv.1, or of Enos, when 'men began to call upon the Name of Jehovah,' G.iv.26. If, then, it was first made known in the time of Moses, how can we account for so many names appearing in the Chronicles, of persons who lived *before* that age, which are compounded with Jehovah, to say nothing of the Name itself being so freely put into the mouths of all kinds of persons, in the Jehovistic portions of the book of Genesis? If, on the other hand, the statements in G.iv.1,26, are true, then, as names compounded with Elohim were common enough, how is it that none are found compounded with Jehovah till more than two thousand years after the time of Enos,—appearing first, but then, according to the Chronicler, as plentifully as in far later times, in the age of Jacob's great-grandchildren?

306. If, indeed, such names had first appeared *after* the time referred to in E.vi, we might have supposed that then, by the *republication* of the Name, a fresh impulse was given to its being freely used among the people.

But the Chronicler's data forbid such a supposition. According to him, the name first began to be used freely, and then it was used very freely, in the composition of names, among Jacob's great-grandchildren, while they were, we must suppose, miserable slaves in the land of Egypt. However, the character of the Chronicler's statements is sufficiently shown by the fact, that in the very age, in which he gives so many of these names, the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, amidst their numerous additional names, furnish not one single instance of this kind, except, as before, Joshua and Jochebed.

307. It should be observed that the inference, which, as it seems to us, may be fairly drawn from the fact above stated, is two-fold:—

(i) That main portions of the Pentateuch and book of Joshua were composed *before* the name Jehovah had been long in such familiar use, as to be freely employed in the formation of Proper Names;

(ii) That they were, probably, not written in the later ages, to which many eminent critics are disposed to assign them,—were not written, for instance, *long after* the age of Solomon, or even long after the latter part of David's life, when Proper Names compounded with Jehovah began to be common, as the history shows, and, therefore, such names would most likely have crept into the text. Thus we have David's sons, Adonijah, and Shephatiah, 2S.iii.4, Jedidiah, Solomon's other name, xii.25, Jonadab, David's nephew, xiii.3, Jonathan, the son of Abiathar, xv.27, Benaiah, Jehoiada, and Jehoshaphat, xx.23,24, another Benaiah, Jonathan, Uriah the Hittite, xxiii.30,32,39.

CHAPTER IX.

THE DERIVATION OF THE NAME MORIAH.

308. THERE is, however, *one* word in Genesis, the name of a *place*, Moriah, G.xxii.2, which appears at first sight to be compounded with Jehovah. HENGSTENBERG, i.274-277, insists very strongly on this point; and,

for the sake of the Hebrew student and critic, we have considered his arguments at length in (Part II.312).

309. For the ordinary English reader, however, it will be sufficient to say:—

(i) This is the *only* instance in the whole book of Genesis, where any name of place or person is (apparently) compounded with the name Jehovah; it is, therefore, highly probable from the first, that the derivation maintained by HENGSTENBERG is erroneous.

(ii) It is *most unlikely* that this place was *generally* known—as the Divine command in v.2, ‘Get thee into the land of Moriah,’ evidently implies)—known, therefore, to the idolatrous Canaanites,—by a name compounded with Jehovah, when there is not a single other instance, in the whole Bible, of the existence of *another* name, so compounded, *in that age*.

(iii) It is *impossible* that the place could have been already known familiarly as ‘Moriah,’ which means, according to HENGSTENBERG, ‘appearance of Jehovah,’ *before* that very ‘appearance of Jehovah’ took place, described in the story, G.xxii, to which the giving of the name itself is ascribed: that is to say, it is impossible that when God said to Abraham, ‘Get thee into the land of Moriah,’ He could have commanded Abraham to go to a land *which was not yet known by the name by which He called it*.

310. It remains now to be considered what may, perhaps, be the real meaning and origin of the name Moriah.

The argument of HENGSTENBERG rests mainly on one assumption, *viz.* that the ‘*mount*,’ which he *supposes* to be indicated by the name ‘Moriah’ in G.xxii.2, is the same as that ‘*mount Moriah*,’ which is actually mentioned in the Hebrew text of 2Ch.iii.1, as the hill at Jerusalem on which the Temple was built, and where an ‘appearance of Jehovah’ took place, according to the Chronicler, in the time of David, corresponding to this first ‘appearance of Jehovah’ to Abraham.

311. Now first, let it be observed that G.xxii.2 does not speak of any ‘*mount Moriah*,’ but of the ‘*land of Moriah*,’ which is supposed to have been well-

known to Abraham; whereas the *mount*, on which he was to sacrifice his son, was not as yet known to him, but was to be pointed out to him by God Himself:—

‘Take now thy son, thine only son, Isaac, whom thou lovest, and get thee into the *land of Moriah*, and offer him there for a burnt-offering, upon *one of the mountains which I will tell thee of*.’

312. Again, the narrative says, v.14, that Abraham called the place of sacrifice,—that is, this very *mount*—by the name ‘Jehovah-Jireh.’ It is very arbitrary to suppose that the writer meant it to be understood that he did *not* really call it by *this* name, but by *another* name, ‘Moriah,’—by which name, however, the whole district round was, according to the story in G.xxii.2, already generally known!

313. Hence it is not surprising to find that some of the principal ancient versions say nothing whatever of the ‘*land of Moriah*,’ but translate the corresponding Hebrew word by ‘high,’ ‘conspicuous,’ ‘visible,’ &c. Thus the LXX. have ‘into the *high* land,’—AQUILA, ‘into the conspicuous land,’—SYMMACHUS, ‘into the land of the *vision*,’ not (N.B.) ‘into the land of the vision of Jehovah,’—the *Vulgate*, in *terram visionis*, ‘into the land of vision.’

314. But the fact is, that in only one single place of the O. T., *viz.* in the above passage of the Chronicles, written (222) two hundred years after the Captivity, is the name Moriah, whatever may be its meaning, applied to the Temple Hill at all. In all earlier writings after the time of Solomon, in the later Psalms, and in the Prophets, the hill, on which the Temple stood, is without exception called *Zion*. Wherever mention is made of the Sanctuary, Jehovah’s earthly dwelling-place, *Zion* is invariably named, never once Moriah.

315. The following are some of the passages of Scripture, which prove that the *Temple*, as well as the Tabernacle, was built on Mount *Zion*. We omit many, where ‘*Zion*’ may be understood as standing for the whole city of Jerusalem, and also a multitude of passages which occur in the *Psalms*, since it might be disputed whether

these were written *before* or *after* the days of David. But THURPP truly observes, *Ancient Jerusalem*, p.24 :—

It cannot be denied that the idea of 'holiness' is inseparably connected with the name Zion; and, if Zion was the Temple-Hill, it is easily seen why Jerusalem, as the holy city, should be called by this name; but, had Zion been exactly the part of the city in which the Temple did *not* stand, then the use of the name Zion to convey the idea of holiness, becomes absolutely inexplicable.

316. The following passages from the Prophets were certainly written while the Temple was still standing, and they refer plainly to the Sacred Hill itself, and not to the city.

'Blow ye the trumpet in Zion, and sound an alarm in my holy mountain.' Joel ii.1.

'So shall ye know that I am Jehovah your God, dwelling in Zion, my holy mountain.' Joel iii.17.

'Upon Mount Zion shall be deliverance, and there shall be holiness.' Ob.17.

'Jehovah of Hosts, which dwelleth in Mount Zion.' Is.viii.18.

'The place of the Name of Jehovah of Hosts, the Mount Zion.' Is.xviii.7.

'Jehovah shall reign over them in Mount Zion from henceforth, even for ever.' Mic.iv.7.

317. In the following passages Mount Zion is expressly distinguished from the whole city of Jerusalem.

'In Mount Zion and in Jerusalem shall be deliverance.' Joel ii.32.

'When Jehovah hath performed His whole work upon Mount Zion and on Jerusalem.' Is.x.12.

'When Jehovah of Hosts shall reign in Mount Zion and in Jerusalem.' Is.xxiv.23.

So, too, after the return from the Captivity and the rebuilding of the Temple, we read, Zech.viii.3—

'Thus saith Jehovah, I am returned unto Zion, and will dwell in the midst of Jerusalem; and Jerusalem shall be called a city of truth, and the mountain of Jehovah of Hosts, the holy mountain :—

where the parallelism of the Hebrew poetry shows that 'Zion' is the 'mountain of Jehovah, the holy mountain.'

318. Again, in the time of the Maccabees we read :—

'Upon this all the host assembled themselves together, and went up into Mount Zion; and when they saw the sanctuary desolate and the altar profaned, and the gates burned up, and shrubs growing up in the courts, as in a forest, or in one of the mountains, yea, and the Priests' chambers pulled down, &c.' 1M. iv.37,38.

'So they went up to Mount Zion with joy and gladness, where they offered burnt-offerings, &c.' 1M.v.54.

'After this went Nicanor up to Mount Zion, and there came out of the Sanctuary certain

of the Priests, &c.' 1M.vii.33; see also 'I will burn up this House,' r.35.

'So then they wrote it on tables of brass, which they set upon pillars in Mount Zion,' 1M.xiv.27; comp. r.48. 'So they commanded that this writing should be put in tables of brass, and that they should be set up within the compass of the Sanctuary in a conspicuous place.'

319. It is true that in this age the 'city of David' was evidently distinguished from 'mount Zion'; since the Syrian king's forces held a strong 'tower' in the 'city of David,' 1M.ii.31, vi.26, vii.32, xiii.49, 52, xiv.7, 36, while the Jews fortified the 'mount Zion,' 1M.iv.60, vi.7, 26, 48, 51, 54, 61, 62, x.11, xiii.52; whereas Zion is called the 'city of David,' in 2S.v.7, 1K.viii.1, 1Ch.xi.5. Perhaps, the 'city of David' with its 'tower' occupied the site of the old Jebusite fortress upon the northern end of Mount Zion; whereas the 'Sanctuary' was built upon the southern eminence of the same Mount; and hence we read, 1M.xiii.52, of the 'hill of the temple that was by the tower.' But, however this apparent discrepancy may be explained, and whatever view may be taken of the Chronicler's solitary note of the name 'Moriah' being given to the Temple-Hill, it may be considered as certain, from the above evidence, that both the Tabernacle and Temple were built on mount Zion, which fact we shall find to be of some importance, in considering the age of certain of the Psalms.

320. Although, therefore, the name Moriah may have been commonly used for the Temple-Hill in the Chronicler's days, (though this must be considered doubtful,) yet the fact above stated leads us at once to two conclusions :—

(i) That no writer of later days, *before* the Captivity, could have written this story of Abraham's sacrifice, introducing the name *Moriah*, in order to attach celebrity to the Temple-Hill; since such a writer would surely have sought to attach such honour to the name of *Zion*;

(ii) That the Jews, from David's time and downwards, never could have understood the hill of Abraham's sacrifice to have been mount Moriah, the Temple-Hill; since then the Psalmists and Prophets would surely have made

free use, or made use occasionally, of this name Moriah, and not of Zion exclusively. As it is, there is no indication in the Bible, except in this one very late notice of the untrustworthy Chronicler, that the Temple-Hill was ever really called by this name.

321. The reader's attention may now be called to the following extract from DEAN STANLEY's *Sinai and Palestine*, p.250-253.

What is affirmed by the Gentile tradition, with regard to the connection of Gerizim with Melchizedek, is affirmed by the Samaritan tradition, with regard to its connection with the sacrifice of Isaac. 'Beyond all doubt,' (this is the form in which the story is told amongst the Samaritans themselves,) 'Isaac was offered on Ar-Gerizim. Abraham said, 'Let us go up, and sacrifice on the mountain.' He took out a rope to fasten his son; but Isaac said, 'No! I will lie still.' Thrice the knife refused to cut. Then God from heaven called to Gabriel, 'Go down, and save Isaac, or I will destroy thee from among the angels.' From the seventh heaven Gabriel called, and pointed to the ram.' The place of the ram's capture is still shown near the Holy Place. The Jewish tradition, as represented by Josephus, transfers the scene to the hill, on which the Temple was afterwards erected at Jerusalem; and this belief has been perpetuated in Christian times, as attached to a spot in the garden of the Abyssinian Convent, not, indeed, on Mount Moriah, but immediately to the east of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, with the intention of connecting the sacrifice of Isaac with the Crucifixion. An ancient thorn tree, covered with the rags of pilgrims, is still shown as the thicket in which the ram was caught.

But the Samaritan tradition is confirmed by the circumstances of the story. Abraham was 'in the land of the Philistines,' probably at the extreme south. From Beersheba to Gaza he would probably be conceived to move along the Philistine plain; and then on the morning of the third day he would arrive in the plain of Sharon, exactly where the massive height of Gerizim is visible 'afar off,' and from thence half a day would bring him to its summit. Exactly such a view is to be had in that plain; and, on the other hand, no such view or impression can fairly be said to exist on the road from Beersheba to Jerusalem, even if what is at most a journey of two days could be extended to three. The towers of Jerusalem are, indeed, seen from the ridge of Mar Elias, at the distance of three miles. But there is no elevation, nothing corresponding to the 'place afar off,' to which Abraham 'lifted up his eyes.' And the special locality, which Jewish tradition has assigned for the place, and whose name is the chief guarantee for the tradition,—Mount Moriah, the Hill of the Temple,—is not visible, till the traveller is close upon it, at the southern edge of the valley of Hinnom, from whence he looks down upon it, as on a lower eminence.

322. The same author writes as follows, *Lectures on the Jewish Church*, p.48,49:—

From the tents of Beersheba, he set forth at the rising of the sun, and went unto the place of which God had told him. It was not the place which Jewish tradition has selected on Mount Moriah in Jerusalem,—still less that which Christian tradition shows, even to the thicket in which the ram was caught, hard by the Church of the Holy Sepulchre,—still less that which Mussulman tradition indicates on Mount Arafat, at Mecca. Rather we must look to that ancient Sanctuary of which I have already spoken, the natural altar on the summit of Mount Gerizim. On that spot, at that time the holiest in Palestine, the crisis was to take place. One, two, three days' journey from Beersheba,—in the distance the high crest of the mountain appears. And 'Abraham lifted up his eyes and saw the place afar off.'

323. To the above I will add the following remarks.

(i) It is much more probable that the site of such a sacrifice would be laid upon the 'smooth sheet of rock' upon the top of Mount Gerizim, in a central situation, visible, as the Table Mountain near Maritzburg in Natal, like a huge natural altar, to all the country round, yet where the transaction would be private and concealed from men's eyes, than on the low hill of the Temple, in the southern district of Judah, and in the immediate neighbourhood of the Jebusite city of Jerusalem, if not, indeed, actually included within its circuit, for Araunah the Jebusite lived upon it in David's days, and his family may have lived there in Samuel's.

(ii) In D.xi.30 we read of Mount Gerizim and Mount Ebal:—

'Are they not on the other side Jordan, by the way where the sun goeth down, in the land of the Canaanites, which dwell in the campaign over against Gilgal, beside the terebinths (E.V. 'plains') of Moreh?'

But there was evidently one very remarkable hill or mountain in that land, since in Ju.vii.1 we read of the host of the Midianites being 'on the north side of the hill of Moreh, in the valley.' Now Gerizim was noted, both as the *highest*, and also as one of the *most fertile*, of the hills of that district. May not Gerizim and Ebal have been 'the mountains' of the 'land of Moreh,' one of which was to be pointed out to Abraham?

(iii) Moreh was already distin-

guished and hallowed as the place where Abram first halted, after his entrance into the land of Canaan, G.xii.6,—

‘And Abram passed through the land unto the place of Sichem, unto the terebinth (E.V. ‘plain’) of Moreh.’

It was, therefore, closely connected with the life of Abraham, whereas the ‘mount’ at Jerusalem was wholly strange to it.

324. The later Jews may have had the same reason for corrupting this passage in Genesis, by changing ‘Moreh’ into ‘Moriah,’ so as to draw away attention and honour from the famous, or, in their view, infamous, Samaritan mountain to their own Temple-hill, as they had for making the change in D.xxvii.4, Jo.viii.30, where, according to KENNICOTT, *Diss.ii.c.1*, they have really changed the original *Gerizim*, which still stands in the Samaritan copies of the Pentateuch, into *Ebal*. By this change,—instead of *Gerizim*, the mount of blessing, D.xxvii.12, on which Joshua himself, with the royal tribe of Judah, the priestly tribe of Levi, and his own tribe of Joseph, were to stand ‘to bless the people,’ v.12—they have made *Ebal*, the mount of cursing, D.xxvii.13, to be the mount, on which Joshua and all Israel were to build an altar, and offer peace-offerings, and eat there, and rejoice before Jehovah their God, and set up great stones, with the Law engraved upon them, to remain as a record for all future ages.

CHAPTER X.

THE NAMES ELOHIM AND JEHOVAH.

325. THE word ELOHIM is a plural noun,—derived, it is supposed, from a root, which still exists in Arabic, meaning ‘to fear, dread, tremble.’ Hence the word means properly ‘fear,’ then ‘object of fear’: comp. G.xxxi.42,53, where God is called ‘the Fear of Isaac.’ Hence it follows that Elohim, by virtue of its original meaning, is the general name for Deity in Hebrew, and may be used, accordingly, for a heathen God.

326. It is, therefore, quite a mistake to think of proving the doctrine of the Trinity, as some do, from the fact, that Elohim is a plural name. It is true,

this plural noun is generally used with a singular verb,—but not always; for it occurs with a plural verb in G.xx.13, and with a plural adjective or participle in Jo.xxiv.19, Ps.lviii.12. And, as above mentioned, it is used of an idol,—Dagon, 1 S.v.7, Astarte, 1 K.xi.5, Baalzebub, 2 K.i.2,3,6,—as well as of the True God. It is, therefore, most probably, a *pluralis excellentie*, according to the very common Hebrew idiom, by which a plural noun is used to express a superlative degree of excellence of any kind. Thus we have—

‘A cruel lords,’ Is.xix.4,—‘If I am a lords, where is my fear?’ Mal.i.6,—‘the Holy Ones,’ Pr.xi.10, Hos.xi.12,—‘God my Makers,’ Job xxxv.10,—‘Remember thy Creators,’ Ecc.xii.1,—‘thy Husbands is thy Makers,’ Is.lv.5,—‘Jehovah is thy Keepers,’ Ps.cxxi.5.

So, too, Adonai, ‘Lord,’ so often used for God, is plural; and in D.x.17 we have the double plural, ‘Lords of lords.’

327. The name ‘JEHOVAH,’ however, is never used of a heathen god. It is the proper Personal Name of Him, who is declared to be emphatically the covenant God of the Hebrew people,—

‘Jehovah the God of your fathers, the God of Abraham, of Isaac, and of Jacob,’ E.iii.16,—‘Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews,’ v.18,—‘Jehovah, your God,’ vi.7.

Hence it is never used as an *appellative*, as Elohim often is. Thus we may find it written, ‘thy Elohim,’ ‘Jehovah, your Elohim,’ &c. but not ‘thy Jehovah,’ ‘Elohim, our Jehovah.’

328. In E.iii.14, ‘I AM THAT I AM,’ we find explained, apparently, the derivation of the name, ‘Jehovah,’ according to the writer’s view, from the Hebrew word *hawah*, ‘to be.’ Whether this be the true origin of the Sacred Name or not, it appears to have been that which approved itself to the writer of E.iii.14.

And, thus derived, the name ‘Jehovah’ may be considered to mean ‘HE IS,’ in opposition to the gods of the Gentiles, ‘which are not,’ which are ‘no gods,’ Is.xxxvii.19, and to represent, in the mouths of men, the ‘self-existent Being,’ the ‘Eternal,’ the ‘Living God,’ ‘Who was, and is, and is to come,’ Rev.i.8; whereas ‘I AM’ could only properly be used, as in E.iii.14, by the Divine Being Himself.

329. The *Elohist*, then, represents this name 'Jehovah' as having been first announced to Moses and the Israelites at the time of the Exodus. And he carefully avoids using it in all the foregoing part of the story from Adam downwards, through the times of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph, to that of Moses. The *Jehovist* uses it freely all along. And, without giving any account of its first introduction, he puts it in the mouth of Eve, G.iv.1, and remarks incidentally that, as early as the time of Enos, 'men began to call upon the Name of Jehovah,' G.iv.26.

330. The question now to be considered is, which of these two writers gives the true account, or, rather, is *either* statement correct? Does not the very existence of this discrepancy suggest the probability of neither version of the story being the right one? May it not be possible that the *Elohist* wrote at a time when the word was new,—when it had only been recently introduced, as the *national* Personal Name for the Divine Being, with the view of drawing more distinctly the line of demarcation between the people of Israel,—now first gathered under a king, and no longer living in scattered, separate, tribes,—and the idolatrous nations round them?

331. May not the *Elohistic* writer, wishing to enforce the adoption of this Name, have composed for the purpose this portion of the Mosaic story, while the later *Jehovist*, writing when the Name, though not, perhaps, even yet in common every-day use, was beginning to be more generally known, and was, at all events, familiar to himself, uses it freely from the first? And may not these later passages have been blended into one with the original narrative, either by the *Jehovist* himself, if he was merely an interpolator, or by some later editor, if the *Jehovist* was an independent writer, without its being perceived, or, at least, without its being *felt* *very strongly*, that a contradiction was thereby imported into the narrative, as, in fact, it was not perceived that G.ii contradicted G.i, and that G.vii contradicted G.vi, and so in many other

instances, of which we shall have to take account hereafter?

332. In suggesting this, we assume, of course, that, from what we have already seen of the unhistorical character, generally, of the account of the Exodus, it is no longer necessary to believe that the name Jehovah really originated in the way described in E.vi. Yet it must have originated in *some* way,—at some time or other,—in the real history of the Hebrew people, just as the Zulu Name for the Creator, Unkulunkulu, 'the Great-Great-One,' must have been first used by some deep-thinking person in some part or other of *their* past history. Is it not *possible*, then, that the Name Jehovah may have been first employed by such a man as SAMUEL, in order to mark more distinctly the difference between the Elohim of the Hebrews and the Elohim of the nations round them, and make it more difficult for them to fall away to the practice of idolatry?

333. Certainly, it would be much more easy and natural to suppose, if that were supported by the actual evidence in the case before us, that SAMUEL, or whoever else composed the *Elohistic* document, *found* the Name already in use among his people, and with some legendary traditions attached to it, as to the way in which it was first made known to them by Moses, during their march through the wilderness. If it were right to wish any fact of history to be other than it really is, one would rather *desire* such a solution of the present difficulty, and gladly embrace it. But a firm and honest adherence to the results of critical enquiry, as set forth in the following chapters, does not, in our judgment, allow of our making this supposition. They seem to compel us to the conclusion, that the Name was really new to the Hebrew people in the days of Samuel; and, if so, we can scarcely avoid the inference that he himself must have first adopted it.

334. In that case, he may have written the account of the revelation to Moses in E.vi, with the view of accounting for the origin of the Name, and may have carefully abstained from using it in his narrative, until it was

thus, as it were, introduced with authority. We may conceive that the sheets of parchment or papyrus, on which the old Seer had inscribed, as best he could, the early annals of the Hebrew history, were left at his death,—*unfinished*, probably,—in the hands of the members of his 'School,' for whose instruction, in fact, they were, as we suppose, composed in the first instance, though their Teacher's large and patriotic mind would embrace, no doubt, the whole population of the land, whom he hoped gradually to reach by means of their influence.

335. This unfinished work, then, would fall naturally, after the Seer's death, into the custody of some disciple of Samuel, one of the 'Prophets' of his 'School,' such, for instance, as Nathan or Gad,—not exactly, therefore, a *contemporary* of the Seer, so as to have shared in his counsels from the first, and to have taken a deep personal interest in the original plan,—and, yet living at a time so near to *his* time, that the Name, Jehovah, though well-known to those of higher mind, such as David and the Prophets and Priests of his age, was not yet thoroughly *popularised*, was not, therefore, used as familiarly as the old name Elohim, in the common speech of the people at large, nor compounded freely in their Proper Names. And he, who had already, perhaps, witnessed the actual growth of the history under his master's hands, and had imbibed, we may suppose, some portion of his spirit, might very properly seek to carry on and perfect so interesting and useful a work; he might even have been charged by the dying Seer himself to do so.

336. Accordingly, he may have done his best to this end, either by writing a separate narrative, which at first existed in an independent form, but was incorporated by a later editor with the Elohist document, or by directly interpolating the original story, making additions here and there from any sources at his command, illustrating, amending, enlarging, and, perhaps, at times abridging it, and filling up the latter portion of the narrative, which was left, perhaps, altogether incomplete. Such a writer

as this, accustomed from his youth upwards, as one of Samuel's pupils, to use habitually, in his common discourse, the name Jehovah, as the Proper Name of the God of Israel, might not adhere to this peculiarity of the earlier narrative, but might use the name Jehovah freely from the first, and might, indeed, desire, or think it best, to represent it as a Name known to pious worshippers from a very early age.

337. Should it further appear, as I believe it will, that there is very little in the Pentateuch *after* E.vi which really belongs to the Elohist, who seems to have either brought his story to a close very abruptly, or to have left it, towards the conclusion, in a *very* imperfect and defective state, there would have been the less reason for this second writer to have considered it incumbent on him to adhere strictly to the plan of the Elohist. He may, therefore, have determined altogether to abandon it in his own composition, and to represent the name Jehovah, as used commonly among men from the days of Enos downwards.

338. In that case, however, and supposing that he did not compose an original, independent, narrative, but wrote only to supplement the primary story, he must have retained deliberately the grand Elohist chapter, E.vi, as too interesting and important to be omitted in the story of the Exodus, though aware of the inconsistency thus occasioned, or, it may be, as above suggested, because he did *not* feel very strongly the contradiction thus involved, any more than those which exist between his own accounts of the Creation and the Flood, and those of his predecessor. And so there are multitudes of devout and thoughtful readers, who have studied the Bible closely in our own days, without perceiving these obvious discrepancies.

339. It would be very natural, however, for a writer such as this, upon first introducing the Name Jehovah into the story,—a Name, as we suppose, not yet thoroughly popularised,—to *couple* it with the familiar Name Elohim, so making the transition, as it were, more easy. In this way, perhaps, we may ac-

count for the fact that in G.ii.4—iii.24, the *first* Jehovistic section of the Bible, the Name 'Jehovah' occurs *twenty* times, and always in the form 'Jehovah Elohim,' LORD GOD,—not 'Jehovah' only, as in the subsequent section, which, however, as will be shewn hereafter, is due to the same writer.

340. This circumstance also rather tends to confirm the idea, that the writer composed it at a time, when the Name, though already familiar to himself, was not yet universally employed, and that he wished in this way to commend it to popular acceptance, instead of merely adopting it as a word already common in the mouths of the people.

In like manner, the Zulus can speak of the Unkulunkulu of this, or that, person, or people. In the Church of England Missions, however, the word uDio has been introduced for the Name of God, as specially set forth in Christian teaching. And it is not uncommon for a missionary to join the two together, in speaking to the natives, in the form uDio-Nkulunkulu.

341. At present, however, the suggestions, which we have made above, are only conjectural, except to this extent, that—

(i) We have seen reason already to conclude with certainty (240) that large portions, at least, of the story of the Exodus must have been written long after the time of Moses and Joshua, whatever relics of that earlier age may still, perhaps, be retained in the narrative;

(ii) We can scarcely doubt that the age of Samuel is the *earliest* age, after the time of the Exodus, at which such a history can be conceived to have been written;

(iii) We have observed some indications (234), which seem to point to the age of Samuel, as the time at which some portions of the Pentateuch may have been written;

(iv) We have reason to believe (276) that Samuel and his pupils did actually employ themselves in historical composition.

Let us now see if we can bring any proofs to bear more directly on this question.

CHAPTER XI.

THE ELOHISTIC PSALMS OF DAVID.

342. LET it first be observed that, in the Pentateuch, and Book of Joshua, so soon as the Name Jehovah is proclaimed, it appears constantly in every page as the *ruling* Name, the word habitually and most commonly employed for the Divine Being. This continues also through the books of Judges, Ruth, Samuel, and Kings. The Name Elohim is also used, but *far more frequently* the Name Jehovah.

343. Thus a careful examination of each book gives the following result, reckoning only those instances in which the Name El or Elohim is applied to the True God, and not to human beings or idols.

	Elohim	Jehovah
Exodus	134 . . .	393
Leviticus	52 . . .	311
Numbers	34 . . .	396
Deuteronomy	334 . . .	550
Joshua	67 . . .	224
Judges	52 . . .	174
Ruth	3 . . .	18
1 Samuel	97 . . .	320
2 Samuel	59 . . .	153
1 Kings	88 . . .	258
2 Kings	77 . . .	277

In Jo. ii.9—12, the Name Jehovah is put *four* times into the mouth of the *Canaanitish* harlot, Rahab. In N.xxii—xxiv it occurs *twelve* times in the addresses of the *heathen prophet*, Balaam, and Elohim only *eleven* times; nay, he is actually made to say,—

'I cannot go beyond the word of Jehovah, my God,' N.xxii.18.

344. Thus it cannot be doubted that the story, as told in the Pentateuch and all the other historical books, represents the Name Jehovah as being far more common in the mouth of the people generally than the Name Elohim, all along downwards, from the time of its being announced as the special Name, by which the God of Israel would be known to His people.

345. If, then, we have any means of testing independently the truth of this representation, we shall thus have light thrown, from an entirely new quarter, upon the question now before us, as to the historical veracity of the Books of the Pentateuch. If we find, upon cer-

tain evidence, that the Name Jehovah *was* thus habitually employed by men, who, beyond all doubt, lived and wrote within the period embraced by these Books, we shall have *so far* an agreement with the Mosaic story, that there is here no contradiction to it, though, in face of the evidence, already produced, of the unhistorical character of the narrative, even such an agreement as this would not, of course, avail to establish its historical veracity.

346. But if, on the other hand, we find the exact contrary,—if we find that, so far from the Name Jehovah being habitually used, it was used *very rarely*, much less freely than Elohim, and often *not at all*, by most eminent writers, who must have been familiar with the Name, and must have used it, if it was really common in their days,—we shall have here a direct and palpable contradiction to the intimations of the Mosaic Books, and a strong independent proof, in addition to what we have observed already, of the unhistorical character of the Mosaic story.

347. Let us examine, then, for this purpose, the Book of Psalms, and those Psalms especially, in the first instance, which appear by their titles to have been written in the earlier part of David's life. And let us see if David makes use of the Name Jehovah, as freely as we should expect him to use it, from what we find in the Pentateuch, — as freely as he *must* have used it, if the word was in common use in his days, and believed to have had set upon it the seal, as it were, of Jehovah Himself, as the Name by which He would be known as the Covenant God of Israel. It is true that the titles of the Psalms may be—and most probably are—in many cases, of much later date than the Psalms themselves, and are not to be depended on, when unsupported by internal evidence of their truthfulness. But the contents of a Psalm will sometimes confirm the statement in the title, as to the occasion on which it was composed, and be sufficient to satisfy us both as to its having been written by David, or, at least, in David's lifetime, and as to the

part of his life, in which it was, most probably, written.

348. Of the hundred and fifty Psalms contained in the Bible, nearly *half*, viz. *seventy-three*, are, by their titles attributed to David in the Hebrew text, while the LXX assign eleven others to him. Of the above seventy-three, fourteen have inscriptions which specify the event in David's life, with reference to which the Psalm was composed. Eight of these inscriptions refer to events in his *earlier* years, before he was king.

349. Of these eight, six, when examined, give the following results:—

(i) In Ps.liii, when 'Doeg, the Edomite, came and told Saul, and said unto him, David is come to the house of Ahimelech,' we have Elohim *five* times, Jehovah *not once*.

(ii) In Ps.liv, when 'the Ziphims came and said to Saul, doth not David hide himself with us?' we have Elohim *four* times, Adonai (Lord) *once*, Jehovah (LORD) *once*.

(iii) In Ps.lvi, when 'the Philistines took David in Gath,' at the court of Achish, we have Elohim *nine* times, Jehovah *once*.

(iv) In Ps.lvii, when 'David fled from Saul in the cave,' we have Elohim *seven* times, Lord *once*, Jehovah *not once*.

(v) In Ps.lix, when 'Saul sent, and they watched the house to kill him,' we have Elohim *nine* times, Lord *once*, Jehovah *three* times. But, in this Psalm, the expression in v.11, 'Slay them not, lest *my people* forget it,' would seem to imply that the writer was *king* at the time, and, therefore, that, if written by David at all, it was composed at a later date than that which the title ascribes to it.

(vi) In Ps.lxiii, when 'David was in the wilderness of Judah,' we have Elohim *three* times, Jehovah *not once*.

350. The above are *all* the Psalms ascribed to David (with two exceptions, Ps.xxxiv, Ps.cxlili, to be considered presently), whose early age is distinctly intimated in their titles; and in each instance we see a phenomenon the very opposite to that, which the Pentateuch and other historical books would lead us to expect. And let it be observed that this is true, supposing that these Psalms were really written by David, whether he wrote them on the occasions mentioned in the titles, or not, and even if they were not written by David at all, but by some other person *of that age*. But, if the titles can be relied on, (as some writers so strenuously maintain), it would follow from this that in David's earlier days,—at a time when he was in close intimacy with the venerable Prophet Samuel, with whom,

we are told, he stayed some time at Ramah, 1S.xix.18, while a fugitive from Saul, and when he must, doubtless, have mingled with the Prophets of Samuel's 'School,' have heard their sacred hymns, and taken part in their religious services,—though he *knew* the Name Jehovah, yet he was certainly *not* in the habit of using it *freely*; he either used it not at all in his compositions, or used it very sparingly, *as if he was only now beginning to use it*, as if it was somewhat *new and strange to him* as yet, not so frequent on his lips, not so familiar to his thoughts, as the old and well-known name, Elohim.

351. It is surely inconceivable that a man, so eminently pious as David, should, during a large portion of his life, have been writing a number of Psalms, in which this Name Jehovah is hardly ever employed, *if the story of the giving of the Name is really true*,—if it was known to David that this Name was first revealed to Moses by the Lord Himself, and had the special sanction and approval of Almighty God, as the name by which He chose to be addressed, the proper Name of the God of Israel,—

'This is my Name for ever, and this is my memorial unto all generations,' E.iii.15.

It can hardly be believed that either he, or *any other good man of those days*, could have done this, if the Name was so common in the mouths of all pious and devout men,—even of *heathen* persons,—in his own and all the post-Mosaic ages, as the history represents.

352. But the Psalms, above instanced, are by no means the only cases in which the same phenomenon occurs, among the Psalms ascribed to David. For, if we examine carefully all the thirty-one Psalms of the *Second Book* (216), Ps.xlii: to Ps.lxxii, of which *eighteen*, marked below with an asterisk, are ascribed to David, we shall have the following very noticeable result:—

Ps.	E.	J.	Ps.	E.	J.
42	13	1	51*	6	0
43	8	0	52*	5	0
44	5	0	53*	7	0
45	4	0	54*	4	1
46	7	3	55*	6	2
47	8	2	56*	9	1
48	8	2	57*	7	0
49	2	0	58*	2	1
50	10	1	59*	9	3

Ps.	E.	J.	Ps.	E.	J.
60*	5	0	67	6	0
61*	3	0	68*	31	3
62*	7	0	69*	10	5
63*	3	0	70*	3	2
64*	3	1	71	9	3
65*	3	0	72	3	1
66	8	0			

353. The eighteen Psalms, which are here ascribed to David, include the six which we have just been considering, and which were written, as we have seen, (supposing their titles to be correct), at an early period of his life, when, in fact, he was not yet *thirty* years old. They include, also, three from the *middle* part of his life,—Ps.lx (E.5,J.0), when 'Joab returned, and smote of Edom in the valley of salt, twelve thousand men,' in the *forty-fifth* year of David's life,—Ps.li (E.6,J.0), after his adultery with Bathsheba, in the *fiftieth* year,—and Ps.lxxii. (E.3.J.1)—or, rather (E.1,J.0), since v. 18,19, are merely the doxology (216), added by the compiler in later days, to serve as a close to Book II of the Psalms,—which is entitled 'A prayer for Solomon,' and, if written by David, may have been composed by him shortly after Solomon's birth, in the *fifty-first* or *fifty-second* year of his life.

354. Looking now at the above table, is it conceivable that David should have written the above eighteen Psalms, or any number of them,—in which the name Elohim occurs, on the average, *seven* times to Jehovah *once*, and in *nine* of which Jehovah does *not* occur *at all*, if the latter name was used so freely, so much more freely than Elohim, and under such high sanction, in the common language of the people when he wrote, as the historical books with one voice imply? Nay, every Psalm in this Book shows the same characteristic preference for the word Elohim. And, supposing as we naturally may before further inquiry, that all or most of them are Psalms of about the same age, as they are found in the same collection, and *that* age the age of David, as the titles of so many of them imply, it is obvious that the force of the above argument is just as strong, whether such Psalms were really written by David, or by any other pious writer of those days.

CHAPTER XII.

THE PSALMS OF THE SECOND BOOK.

355. But it may be said 'It is very possible—nay, highly probable—that very many of these Titles are erroneous, and that very many of these Psalms, though ascribed to David, were not really written by David at all.' We grant this fully, and we wish it to be distinctly observed that *our argument does not in the least depend on the accuracy of the Titles*. For our own purposes, indeed, we should gladly at once set aside the Titles altogether, and try to make out the age of any particular Psalm from its internal evidence. But as HENGSTENBERG, one of the chief defenders of the traditional view, is so very decided in maintaining their correctness, it seems best, with Dr. DAVIDSON, ii.255, to 'assume the alleged Davidic authorship' as being *possibly* true, 'till internal evidence proves the contrary.' In order, therefore, to make sure of our ground, it is necessary to examine carefully, one by one, the Psalms of the Second Book, and see if they contain sufficient internal evidence to enable us to fix them, either upon David himself as their author, or else upon the age of David.

356. In Part II (362–428) we have gone through at full length a minute examination of the Psalms of Book II, the result of which is as follows:

(i) There are *three* of these Psalms, viz. Ps.l, Ps.lx, Ps.lxviii, which, as it appears to us, may be assigned from their internal evidence, with very great probability—and, in the case of Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii, with a near approach to certainty—to the age of David;

(ii) There is no strong internal evidence, such as to *compel* us to a similar conclusion, in the case of any other of the Psalms of this Book;

(iii) But, on the other hand, there is no decisive evidence to the contrary; and it is possible that *all* of them *may* have been written in David's time, and even by David himself,—some of them, as the Titles imply, in the *earlier* portion of his life, some in the *middle*, and some in the *latter* years of it,—and, at all events, by some one of that age.

357. With respect, however, to the above three Psalms, li, lx, lxviii,—and especially the last two of them,—on which the whole stress of our argument will be laid,—it seems highly probable that they were actually written *by* or *for* David, and, adopting the Bible chronology, in the *fifty-first*, *forty-fifth*, and *fortieth*, years of his life, respectively. Now, in the first two of these Psalms, Jehovah is not used at all; in the third, Jehovah or Jah occurs *four* times, but Elohim and Adonai *thirty-eight* times. The inference from this fact would seem to be irresistible, viz. that Jehovah was not in common use with one, at least, of the most devout and able writers of that age, unless it can be met by contrary evidence of a very decisive character, showing as certainly that some Psalms were composed, *by* or *for* David in the early part of his life, which contain the name Jehovah as predominantly as Ps.lxviii contains Elohim.

358. We must now proceed to examine carefully the internal contents of each of these three Psalms. Few English readers, indeed—and, certainly, none of the traditional school—would be inclined to doubt the fact of these three Psalms being really David's. But such merely conventional belief will not suffice for our present purposes. We must endeavour to make out, if possible, how the truth really stands in this matter.

359. Ps.li (E.6,J.0) is generally believed to be the genuine utterance of David's 'broken spirit,' when he came to repentance after his grievous sin. It appears to me that this Psalm is assigned in the Title to its true occasion. The writer does not once use in it the name 'Jehovah.' May it have been that, in the anguish of his soul, he had recourse to the old familiar name, Elohim, as a more *real* name, a name dear to him from old associations, one which he had used all along in his childhood and youth, and in the better days of his ripened manhood, rather than to the more modern name, Jehovah?

360. Dr. DAVIDSON, however, observes as follows, ii.253:—

The fifty-first psalm is post-Davidic, as the two last verses prove,—‘Do good in Thy good pleasure unto Zion: build Thou the walls of Jerusalem. Then shalt Thou be pleased with the sacrifices of righteousness, with burnt-offering and whole burnt-offering; then shall they offer bullocks upon Thine altar.’ It is true that they are but loosely appended to the preceding context, and are therefore considered, by many, a later addition. That hypothesis is probably groundless. The psalm was written at a time when the City and Temple of Jerusalem were thrown down. Both *Zion* and the *walls* of the capital are expressly mentioned. Hence the attempts, that have been made to force the meaning into union with David’s crime in relation to Bathsheba, are unworthy of notice. The psalm shows a right sense of sin as committed mainly against God, and a thorough feeling of the worthlessness of external sacrifices, apart from purity of heart or rectitude of motive. Whether views so near the Christian ones were entertained by any Jew as early as David’s time is doubtful. A later than David seems to be required by the apprehension of sin, as well as the state of Jerusalem, implied in the poem. The beginning of the Babylonish Captivity is the probable date.

361. HENGSTENBERG says, ii. p. 182:—

That the Psalm was composed by David on the occasion [of his sin with Bathsheba], appears from the superscription, and also from the wonderful agreement of the contents with 2S.xi,xii. That we have to do here with a sinner of *high rank*, is probable even from v.13, ‘Then will I teach transgressors Thy ways, and sinners shall be converted unto Thee,’—according to which the compassion to be shown to the Psalmist shall operate beneficially through an extensive circle,—but quite certain from the conclusion, v.18,19. That the Psalmist there passes on to pray for the salvation of the whole people, pre-supposes that this salvation was personally connected with himself, that the people stood and fell with him. In v.14 the Psalmist prays for deliverance from *blood-guiltiness*. Such guilt David had incurred through the death of Uriah occasioned by him, and Nathan had threatened him in the name of God with the divine vengeance for it. This is the more remarkable from the circumstances of the case being so singular. Of a true worshipper of God—[much less of a *pious king*!—the whole history of the Old Testament contains nothing similar.

362. EWALD, p. 247, assigns this Psalm to some time after the destruction of the Temple; OLSHAUSEN, p. 226, to the times of the Maccabees. HUPFELD writes as follows, iii. p. 3:—

Against the reference [to David’s sin with Bathsheba] may be urged the manner in which, v.3, &c., the fundamental idea is expressed of more *spiritual* sins, punishable by God and not by man, and the *inner* uncleanness of human nature. The phenomena usually produced by those who deny this reference (e.g. DE WETTE, HRTZIG, EWALD),

—as the ‘disjointed, abrupt, language,’ the multitude of sins, and that here we find the first entreaty for forgiveness of sin, which was already disclosed to David, the obviously later idea of ‘the original sinfulness of man,’—are partly without any foundation, resting only on narrow views of interpretation, and partly not decisive. Only the prayer v.18, ‘for the building of the walls of Jerusalem,’ which assumes their destruction, is manifestly irreconcilable with the notion of its having been composed by David. Yet is this conclusion very loosely appended, and hence it is explained by several interpreters as a later addition. If it is genuine, then the Psalm must belong to the time after the Babylonish Captivity.

363. But we have no reason to suppose *à priori* that such a man as David may not have had a deep spiritual apprehension of the evil of sin, sufficient to account for his language in this Psalm; and, if so, surely, the connection between v.17 and v.18,19, is most natural and intimate. The only ‘sacrifice,’ which *he* can presume to bring, in the consciousness of his great crime, and in the deep sense of God’s forgiving mercy, is ‘a broken spirit’:

‘A broken and a contrite heart, O God, Thou wilt not despise.’

Yet, if God will bless His chosen City, not for its guilty king’s sake, but of His own free grace, and in His own ‘good pleasure’ will ‘do good to Zion,’ then would abundant and acceptable offerings be made by the righteous zeal of its inhabitants, such as his sorrowful and shame-stricken spirit could not think of bringing.

364. The fact, that the writer was a ‘man of rank,’ v.13, who had been guilty of ‘murder,’ v.14, seems to point very strongly to David: and the *whole* language of the Psalm suits thoroughly the story of his sin and of his repentance. In v.18 there seems to be no reference to the ‘walls of Jerusalem’ being *broken down* and in ruins, but only to their being *feeble*, needing to be ‘built up’ and strengthened. The language appears to be used metaphorically, (as in Ps.cxlvii.2, ‘Jehovah doth build up Jerusalem,’ compared with v.13, ‘For He hath strengthened the bars of thy gates,’) with reference to the fact that David had taken the stronghold of Zion, and made Jerusalem his royal city, only *twelve* years before, and that there were still powerful enemies by

whom his kingdom was threatened, as, e.g. the Ammonites, 2S.xii.26-31.

365. Ps.lx(E.5.J.0), however, is, beyond all reasonable doubt, as it appears to us, referred by its title to the true occasion on which it was composed, and of which we read the account in 2S.viii.3, 13, in the *forty-fifth* year of David's life. The fact that in v.7 the writer speaks of his authority as extending over 'Gilead and Manasseh,' i.e. the trans-Jordanic tribes, as well as that of his calling Ephraim 'the strength of his head,' and Judah his own royal tribe, 'his lawgiver,' seems to point, in our judgment, almost with certainty, to David as its author.

366. Dr. DAVIDSON, however, ii.252, considers that this Psalm also 'is much later than David's time,' grounding his conclusion upon these two points:—

(i) v.1-3 shew a very unprosperous state of affairs. The people had experienced great disasters, and were discomfited. The marks of the Divine displeasure were palpable. But the country was not in so disordered a state, at the time of the Syrian war, as is here represented.

Ans. It is very possible that David's forces were not always victorious, in the deadly struggles in which he was engaged while establishing his empire, though such defeats may not have been recorded in the rapid summary of his exploits in 2S.viii. The whole account in 2S.x shows that this time of the Syrian war was a most critical time for him, as, indeed, Job's words intimate, v.12, 'Be of good courage, and let us play the men, for our people, and for the cities of our God; and Jehovah do that which seemeth Him good!'

(ii) Besides, David already possessed the whole land of Canaan. He could not, therefore, appeal in v.6-8, to the promise of Jehovah, that his people should conquer and possess it.

Ans. The language of these verses may only express David's confidence that his kingdom should be permanently confirmed over the tribes of Israel, in accordance with the words of Nathan, 2S.vii.4,17, where the prophet says to him, in the name of Jehovah, 'Thine house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee; thy throne shall be established for ever.' And, as above observed, the words of v.7 seem only applicable to the time of David.

367. HENGSTENBERG observes on this Psalm, ii.p.276:—

'The sketch of the historical circumstances, by which this Psalm was called forth shews that it moves within the same domain as Ps.xliv. Ps.xliv is the earlier of the two; the sons of Korah sang [that Psalm] in the midst of distress, probably whilst David was absent at the Euphrates; David followed them [in this] after succour had been in

some measure obtained. The warlike, confident tone, the triumphant contempt of the enemy expressed in v.8, point to a time of highest prosperity in the state. And, in particular, the reign of David is indicated by the circumstances that the three hostile neighbouring nations, mentioned in this verse, were all singularly defeated by David, and that in v.6,7, the countries on both sides of Jordan, and also Ephraim and Judah, appear as united in one kingdom, of which kingdom Judah was the head—a state of matters which ceased to exist immediately after Solomon, to whose time, however, it is impossible to refer the Psalm, on account of the prevailing warlike character by which it is distinguished. Finally, it is evident, from v.9-13, that the Psalm was composed in view of an expedition against Edom.

368. Even EWALD, p.374, who places the date of its composition *after* the Captivity, considers that *portions of it are of the Davidic age*:—

Ps.lx shows at once that poetry in these sorrowful times (of the Captivity) calls to its help also the force and expression of the ancient poetical science: for, on close examination, there can be no doubt that the words from v.5(7), as far as the first half of v.10(12), are borrowed from an older, and, no doubt, Davidic song. While all the other words quite fall in with the language and state of affairs of this later time, those on the contrary are quite distinct in kind and colouring, subject-matter and meaning; the dissimilarity strikes the eye at the first glance. The old passage proceeds in the following strain: at the time of great pressure in the latter part of David's life, when the Philistines fiercely threatened, comp. 2S.v.17-25, xxiii.9, &c., and the king in the Sanctuary had besought counsel and strength from Jehovah, he records here thankfully the cheering response which he received while struggling with his doubts and distress. How easily a later writer might apply this to the needy and oppressed circumstances of his own time, is obvious; if at that time, it is true, Philistines were not exactly the enemies to be dreaded, yet they were heathens, and 'Philistines' are treated as equivalent to 'heathens.' While, however, the later poet repeated the oracle, as the very centre and life of the whole, untouched and completely unaltered, and even produces something of the context, (v.9(11), and the first three words of v.10(12)), he adds quite a new introduction, and the chief part of the conclusion, in his own words.—Incontestably because the beginning and the remainder of the conclusion of the old song did not sufficiently suit this later time.

369. OLSHAUSEN assigns this Psalm to the time of the Maccabees, but remarks, p.263:—

That the oracle quoted by the Poet in v.6-8 is only borrowed, must in any case be assumed. That it contained, however, a revelation then generally known, perhaps, resting on the authority of the High Priest, and referring to the relations of the time, is much more probable than that it is derived from a Davidic song, as EWALD supposes.

HUFFELD says, iii. p.122:—

This Psalm seems to point to the times of the still-existing kingdom, but to a later time [than that indicated by the Title], since the promise in the oracle expresses the idea, so common in the Prophets, of the *restoration of the unity of the kingdom*, which is preceded by an account of the division of the kingdom and its sorrowful consequences.

Upon careful consideration, however, of its contents, and for the reasons above stated, I cannot doubt that the Psalm in its entirety is, as HENGSTENBERG maintains, a product of the Davidic age, and, probably, from the hand of David himself.

370. In fact, the idea that the words in v.6-8 are supposed to be spoken not by David, but by Jehovah Himself, in the character of a mighty conqueror or ruler, asserting his supremacy over all the countries named, seems inadmissible, for the following reasons:—

(i) Although some of the expressions in v.6-8 might be explained thus, yet such phrases as 'Moab is my washtpot, over Edom will I cast my shoe,' seem hardly such as would be ascribed to Jehovah.

(ii) Why should the 'I,' 'my,' 'me,' in v.6, 7, 8, not refer to the same speaker as the 'me,' in v.9, 'Who will bring me into the strong city? Who will lead me into Edom?'—or in v.5, 'That Thy beloved may be delivered, save with Thy right hand, and hear me,'—which last expressions (be it observed) plainly imply that a *king*, or person in authority is speaking?

(iii) Is not the expression in v.6, 'Elohim hath spoken in His Holiness,' inconsistent with the notion of His speaking the words following merely as a warrior or sovereign? Does not the phrase 'Elohim hath spoken' correspond exactly with the common prophetic formula, 'Jehovah hath spoken,' Is.xxii. 25, Jer.xiii.15, Ez.v.15,17, while the addition of the words 'in His Holiness' is equivalent to saying, 'and He will not depart from it,'—so that the whole sentence corresponds to N.xiv.35, 'I, Jehovah, have spoken, I will surely do it,' or to N.xxiii.19, 'Hath He said, and shall He not do it? or hath He not spoken, and shall He not make it good?' or to Is.xlvi. 11, 'I have spoken, I will also bring it to pass': comp. especially the change of persons in Is.xlviii.15, 'I, even I, have spoken . . . and He shall make his way prosperous,' with 'Elohim hath spoken . . . I will rejoice.'

(iv) Is not, in short, the argument in this Psalm precisely like that employed in Ps. lxxxix.19-37, comp. v.38-45, and see especially, v.49, 'Lord, where are Thy former lovingkindnesses, which Thou swarest unto David in Thy Truth (=in Thy Holiness)?'

371. For the above reasons, it appears to me that the expressions in v.6-8 of this Psalm are the utterances of the Psalmist himself, who relies firmly on the Divine

word which has been pledged to him, and in the midst of all his present distress and alarm, from the disasters experienced in the Edomite war, v.1-3, yet trusts in the faithfulness of God, who 'has given a banner to them that fear Him, to rally to *before the bow*,' (HUFF., Ew., OLS.) v.4, i.e. who has given them a sure ground of confidence in the certainty that His word will not fail them in the end.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE SIXTY-EIGHTH PSALM.

372. Ps.lxviii (E.31,J.4), is also, as it appears to us, undoubtedly a Psalm of David's age, as the Title declares, and we must call attention specially to it, as *one of paramount importance with reference to the question now before us*.

373. That this Psalm is a Psalm of David's age appears as follows:—

(i) In v.16, 'This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in, yea, Jehovah will dwell in it for ever,' we have a plain reference to the hill of Zion; but this, as we have seen (325), does not necessarily point to the Tabernacle, and so to the age of David.

(ii) Again, in v.29, 'Because of Thy Temple at Jerusalem,' we have a reference either to the Tabernacle, 18.i.9, or to the Temple; and so in v.24 mention is made of the 'Sanctuary,' and in v.35 we read, 'O God, Thou art terrible out of Thy holy places.'

(iii) In v.34,35, we read, 'Ascribe yestrength unto God; His excellency is over Israel,' and 'the God of Israel is He that giveth strength and power unto His people.'

This language seems to belong clearly to the time of the undivided kingdom, so that the Psalm was composed in the days of David or Solomon.

(iv) But the martial tone which pervades the Psalm, e.1,12,14,30,35, corresponds to the age of David, not to that of Solomon.

(v) The expressions in v.27, 'There is little Benjamin their ruler, the princes of Judah with their company, the princes of Zebulun, the princes of Naphtali,' belong also to the undivided kingdom, and correspond to the time when Benjamin, which, as the tribe of Saul, had been the ruling tribe in Israel, and had afterwards been ruling again in the person of Saul's son, Ishbosheth, had now submitted itself to David. It may be, therefore, in a politic manner, spoken of here, as being still a tribe of royal dignity.

374. This Psalm contains Elohim *thirty-one* times, and Adonai, Lord, *seven* times, as well as the ancient name Shaddai in v.14; while Jehovah appears only *twice* and Jah *twice*. Manifestly, therefore, the last Name was

less familiar to the writer at the time when he wrote, than Elohim, at all events,—we might almost say, than Adonai also; but it would not be safe to infer this last from a single instance.

375. In *v.4* we have—

'Sing unto God, sing praises to His Name :
extol Him that rideth upon the heavens by
His Name JAH, and rejoice before Him ;'—
OR, (FRENCH and SKINNER),

'Sing ye unto God, hymn His Name!
Raise a highway for Him, who rideth
through the desert!
JEHOVAH is His Name ;
Exult at His Presence !'

It is plain that a special stress is here laid upon the fact that God's Name is Jehovah. Setting aside, as we must, from what we have seen already, the Mosaic story as unhistorical, this seems also rather to imply that the Name had been newly introduced.

376. In *v.1* we read —

'Let Elohim arise, let His enemies be
scattered ;
And let them, that hate Him, flee before
Him.'

And here we have almost the identical words, which are found in N.x.35.

'And it came to pass, when the Ark set forward, that Moses said,
'Arise, Jehovah, and let Thine enemies be
scattered ;
And let them, that hate Thee, flee before
Thee.'

But let it be noted that the Name *Jehovah*, in this passage of Numbers, appears as *Elohim* in the Psalm.

Now, from the general identity of the two passages, either in the E.V., or when compared in the original, it is certain that *one of them has been copied from the other.*

377. Upon which we note as follows :—

(i) Surely, if the *Psalmist* drew his language from so sacred a book as the Pentateuch, according to the traditionary view, must have been, he would not have changed the Name from Jehovah to Elohim.

(ii) Besides, the Name Jehovah, if it had really originated in the way described in the Pentateuch, would have been the very Name required for this Psalm, considering its character, as the Name of the Covenant God of Israel.

(iii) Moreover, *v.1* of the Psalm is closely connected with the words that follow, and has all the appearance of being an original utterance, poured forth by the same impulse which gave birth to them.

(iv) But, if the passage from *Numbers*, as we believe, was written at a later date than

the Psalm, at a time when the Name Jehovah was in common use, (which, apparently, was not the case when the Psalm was written,) it is easy to understand how David's words in this Psalm might have been first used, as most commentators suppose, when the Ark was brought up to Mount Zion, and might afterwards have been adapted by the writer of the passage in Numbers, with the change of the Divine Name, as fit words to be used with every movement of the Ark in the wilderness.

378. Upon the whole, we conclude that this Elohistic Psalm was written *first*, and that in a later day the writer in the Pentateuch adapted the first words of it,—which, he may have even himself helped to chant, when the procession with the Ark wound its way up the hill of Zion,—to the story, which he was writing, of the movements of the host of Israel in the wilderness.

379. The following expressions of this Psalm are also noticeable :—

'O God, when Thou wentest forth before Thy people,
When Thou didst march through the wilderness,
The earth trembled,
Yea, the heavens dropped rain, at the Presence of God,—
Sinai itself trembled,
At the Presence of God, the God of Israel.'
v.7,8.

'The chariots of God are thousands on thousands (E.V. twenty thousand, even thousands of angels) ;
The Lord (Adonai) is among them, as at Sinai, in the Sanctuary.' *v.17.*

'The Lord (Adonai) hath said, I will bring again from Bashan,
I will bring again from the depths of the sea.' *v.22.*

The references in the above verses to the passage of the Red Sea, the transactions at Sinai, and, perhaps, the conquest of Bashan, show that the Psalmist was acquainted with certain portions of the story of Exodus, which might have been already written by SAMUEL, since he died fifteen years before the bringing up of the Ark, and might have composed his narrative many years previously.

380. The above references, however, occurring in a Psalm intended for a public occasion, imply also that those, who would be likely to join in chanting it, must likewise have been familiar, to some extent, with the story of the Exodus. These would not, of course, be the people generally, but only those who would take part in the procession,

—the ‘sons of Heman, and Asaph, and Jeduthun,’ it may be, ‘who should *prophesy* with harps and psalteries and cymbals,’ 1Ch.xxv.1,6, and who, doubtless, had had their training in the ‘School of the *Prophets*’ under Samuel’s direction, where they ‘*prophesied*’ in Samuel’s time, as well as in David’s,—that is, evidently, sang or chanted their psalms of praise,—‘with a psaltery and tabret and pipe and harp before them,’ 1S.x.5.

381. These ‘sons of the Prophets,’ then, as well as any Priests, &c., taking part in the ceremonies, may have been quite familiar with the facts of the Elohistic story, and even have helped already, by mixing with their own families and in other ways, to communicate them in some measure to the people. And, indeed, it is very conceivable that the people may have had among them, in a more imperfect form, the same traditionary remnants of past history, which the Prophet SAMUEL and his School may have used as the basis of their ‘Elohistic story;’ e.g. Ps.lxviii.8, ‘the heavens also dropped,’ and Ju.v.4, ‘the heavens dropped, the clouds also dropped water,’—and the references to the storm of thunder and lightning at the passage of the Red Sea, Ps.lxxvii.16-19,—and Ps.lxxviii.9,—

‘The children of Ephraim, being armed and carrying bows, turned back in the day of battle,’—

of which facts we have no record in the Pentateuch, unless, indeed, a reference may be made to the last in D.i.44.

382. The E.V. of v.15,16, of this Psalm, is as follows:—

The hill of God is as the hill of Bashan,
An high hill as the hill of Bashan.
Why leap ye, ye high hills?
This is the hill which God desireth to dwell in,
Yea, Jehovah will dwell in it for ever.

Thus translated, the ‘hill of God’ can only be understood to mean Mount Zion. But this hill was not remarkably high, and was not even the highest of the two hills of Jerusalem. Probably, the passage should be rendered thus:—

A lofty mountain (*lit.* mountain of God) is the mountain of Bashan,
A mountain of many heights is the mountain of Bashan.

Why leap ye (in your pride), ye mountains of many heights?

This mountain (Zion) hath God chosen to dwell in,
Yea, Jehovah will tabernacle in it for ever.

383. It is probable, as we have said, that few English readers will be disposed to doubt that this Psalm, as well as Ps.li and Ps.lx, is really a Psalm of David’s age, or that it was composed for the occasion to which it is usually referred, the bringing up of the Ark to Mount Zion. HENGSTENBERG, of course, maintains strongly its Davidic origin, in common with the great body of commentators, ancient and modern. Nevertheless, there are some very eminent critics, as HUFFELD, EWALD, OLSHAUSEN, who assign to it a much later date; and, as it is a Psalm of so much importance in our present inquiry, it will be necessary to examine the grounds upon which they have come to this conclusion.

384. The matter has been treated of most fully by HUFFELD in his recent work, *Die Psalmen*, of which vol.iii, containing Ps.lxviii, was published at Gotha in 1860. As this work has been so lately issued, and the author has discussed in it at length the opinions of his predecessors, and has, in fact, exhausted the subject, it may be regarded as representing, generally, the views of this school of critics; so that, having duly weighed his arguments we may assume that we have fairly mastered all that can be said on that side of the question. I will annex, however, all the additional remarks, deserving notice, which I find in EWALD and OLSHAUSEN.

385. HUFFELD observes as follows:—

‘This is a hymn in lofty lyrical style, treating of the entrance of God into His Sanctuary on Zion,—(under the figure of the triumphal progress of a King, who, after conquest of the country, chooses and takes possession of his place of residence, this being introduced with a retrospective glance at the first leading of the people through the Arabian waste, and the conquest of the land of Canaan, but with allusion to ordinary victories and triumphal processions).—His revenge upon the enemies of His people, and His lordship over the nations of the earth, who in conclusion are required to join in the praise of God. Thus much is in general clear, and is admitted by most modern interpreters.’ p.194.

‘The occasion, which most immediately presents itself for this Psalm, is the removal of the Ark by David to Mount Zion, 2S.vi; and this is adopted by most of the ancient and

later interpreters, to the time of ROSEN-MÜLLER. *It gives incontestably the best sense*,—rather, it is the *only* one, which suits not only the choice of Zion in opposition to Sinai and the heights of Bashan, v.15,16, and the historical retrospective glance at the earlier leading of God from Sinai onwards, as introductory to the triumphal entrance, but also the lofty expressions and sentiments connected with it. This is not at all contradicted by the signs of a warlike character, which some consider an objection; since God, as Leader and Guardian of His people, is above all things Warrior and Conqueror over its foes, and, in fact, must first make the conquest of its place of settlement in Canaan. However, it is contradicted (i) by the mention of the 'Temple' and 'Jerusalem,' v.29, (ii) by that of 'Egypt' and 'Ethiopia,' as lands conquered and paying homage, v.30, (iii) by the denunciation of vengeance upon enemies in all parts of the world, v.22-24, and (iv) by the whole later character of the Psalm.' p.196.

And HUFFELD expresses his own view, p.199, that 'in this Psalm we have the hope or promise of the return of the Jewish people from the Babylonish captivity, and the reestablishment of the kingdom of God on Zion in a state of great power,—as it is announced in the later Isaiah, and in close correspondence therewith, perhaps, by the very same author,—in the form of a lyrical utterance, such as frequently occurs in the later Isaiah, in single spirited outbursts, in the midst of the prophetic discourse, but here formed into a complete hymn, *the most spirited, lively, and powerful, which we have in the whole collection of the Psalms.*'

Ans. (i) The very fact that this Psalm is admitted to be 'the most spirited, lively, and powerful,' HUPF. 'the grandest, most splendid, most artistic,' EW. p.297, 'one of the most able and powerful,' OLS. p.286, in the whole book of Psalms, makes it highly improbable—almost incredible—that its author, evidently an original poet of great eminence,—'in whom,' says OLS. p.288, who considers it to be a Maccabean Psalm, in 'spite of the difficulties which meet us in the attempt to understand it, one cannot but recognise a poet of remarkable genius,'—should have been willing to borrow two sentences from two other ancient documents, viz. v.1 from N.x.35, and v.7,8, from Ju.v.4. If we explain his introduction of the former by the fact, that the words quoted are said to have been used of old at every movement of the Ark in the wilderness,—though the Ark appears to have vanished after the Captivity, and, therefore, it is not easy to understand how even the former passage could have been quoted by the later writer, supposed by those critics,—yet how can we account for his introducing the latter? Both these passages, however, as they occur in the Psalm, are in close connexion with the context, and have all the appearance of being part of the original effusion.

We have shown, in fact, in (440-447), that the Psalm was, in all probability, written *first*, and the passages in question copied from it by the later writers of N.x.35 and Ju.v.4.

(ii) In v.29, according to our view, reference is not made to the *Temple*, but to the *Tabernacle* just erected by David. We may

assume that this was a building of some architectural pretensions, to which the term 'temple,' might be applied, as here—a word which is only used with reference to buildings of some importance, as the palace of Ahab, 1K.xxi.1, or that of the king of Babylon, 2K.xx.18, Is.xxxix.7, and, constantly, of the Temple. But it is also used of the Tabernacle at Shiloh, 1S.i.9, iii.3, by the writer of the story of Eli, though in 1S.ii.22 it is called by the usual appellation, '*tent* of the Congregation,' which is the *only* one used throughout the Pentateuch. This suggests that the writer of 1 S.ii.22, may have actually seen with his own eyes the Tabernacle of David, and may have been accustomed to hear it commonly spoken of by the name 'temple,' which he here, accordingly, applies to the Mosaic Tabernacle.

(iii) It is hardly to be thought that the writer of this Psalm, living, as is supposed, amidst the woes of the Captivity, should be predicting here the *conquest* of Egypt and Ethiopia. But the fact is that in v.31 there seems to be no reference to any conquest, but only to the princes of these regions *showing respect and reverence* for the glorious, triumphant, God of Israel, and sending gifts to His Temple. We know that Solomon married Pharaoh's daughter, 1K.iii.1; and it is very probable that relations of some kind, not altogether unfriendly, may have existed between his father and the Court of Egypt. If not, it is easy to understand how expressions of this kind might be used with reference to these two great powers in the immediate neighbourhood of the kingdom of Israel.

(iv) There surely is no reason why a Psalm composed at the time when David was bringing up the Ark to Mount Zion, should not have contained such words as those in v.21-23, denouncing God's judgments upon the enemies of Himself and His people. The many foes of David's rising empire, with whom he was at war both before and after the bringing up the Ark, would abundantly explain such language.

(v) So far from the Psalm giving signs of a 'later character,' it seems to contain very strong indications of an archaic style and a very early origin.

(a) Its language is often very rough and abrupt, and in some places almost unintelligible, for want of those connecting links, and that polish and fulness of expression, which would have characterised a Post-Captivity Psalm: e.g. v.10,11,13,14,17,18, &c.

(b) It has the phrases, 'Sing unto Elohim,' v.4,32, 'Bless ye Elohim,' v.26, 'Praise ye Adonai,' v.32, 'Blessed be Adonai,' v.19, 'Blessed be Elohim,' instead of the 'Hallelu-jah,' 'Praise ye Jehovah,' which would certainly have been found in a *later* Psalm, more especially at the *end*, as in Ps.civ.cv.cvi.cxlii.cxv, cxvi.cxxxv.cxlvi.cxlvii.cxlviii.cxlix.cl; whereas the last of the above four expressions occurs only once more in the whole Bible, viz. in v.29 of the Elohist Psalm, Ps.lxvi (E.S.J.O), and the first, third, and fourth, are only found in the Psalm before us.

(c) As HUFFELD says, p.197, 'the choice and possession of Mount Zion is the very

centre, the essential and characteristic feature, of the Psalm,' which suits well with the occasion in David's time, to which it is usually referred.

(d) The mention of 'little Benjamin, their ruler,' v.27, seems to correspond best, as we have said (379.v), to the time when the tribe of Benjamin had only just been deprived of the royal dignity, by the death of Saul, and, after supporting for a time the cause of Saul's son, Ishbosheth, 2S.ii.9,15,25,31, had yielded to the counsel of Abner, 2S.iii.19, and taken part with David. It is difficult to see how this allusion could well have been made by one writing after the Captivity.

(e) The mention of *four* tribes only in v.27, 'Benjamin and Judah,' 'Zebulon and Naphtali,' as 'representatives of all Israel,' HUFFELD, p.233, is intelligible in David's time, when we observe that the former two were the chief *Southern* tribes, and the latter two, the chief *Northern*, while the great tribe of Ephraim occupied the central part between them, but is not so easily explained on HUFFELD's supposition, *ibid.* that we have here 'a prophetic idea of the reunion of the severed brother-kingdoms, and the restoration of the united kingdom of Israel.' Surely, Zebulon and Naphtali could not have been taken to represent, as HUFFELD supposes, the 'kingdom of Israel,' of which the only proper exponent was the tribe of Ephraim. In Is.ix.1, 'the land of Zebulon and the land of Naphtali' is not used of the whole kingdom of Israel, but only of the northern parts which suffered in the *first* Assyrian invasion, 2K.xv.29, whereas 'Samaria,' or 'Israel' generally, was carried captive in the second invasion, 2K.xvii.6. Further, the omission of any reference in this Psalm to the tribe of Ephraim, as attending the grand ceremony of the bringing up of the Ark, may be due to the fact, that *no representatives of that tribe were present at all on that occasion.* They may, in fact, have resented the act, as an attempt to centralise both the government and worship in the tribe of Judah, and as a slight passed upon their own sacred place of Shiloh, even if Shiloh itself was at the time in ruins. This would not be inconsistent with their afterwards marching under David's command, like turbulent barons under a sovereign prince, to attack the common foe in the great Syrian war, when the national safety and existence were at stake, and when David wrote, as we believe, so warmly of that powerful and populous tribe, 'Ephraim is the strength of my head,' Ps.lx.7. We see evident signs of such a dissatisfied spirit among them in the language ascribed to Jeroboam, at the time of the rebellion of the Ten Tribes and their separation from the house of David: 'And Jeroboam said in his heart, Now shall the kingdom return to the house of David. If this people go up to do sacrifice in the house of Jehovah at Jerusalem, then shall the heart of this people turn again unto the Lord, even unto Rehoboam, king of Judah,' 1K.xii.26,27.

(f) In v.22 we read

'Adonai said, I will bring again from Bashan,

I will bring again from the depths of the sea.'

And these words are supposed by some, as OLSHAUSEN, p.294, to contain a promise that God would bring back the exiles from their wanderings in the *East* (beyond the hills of Bashan) and in *Egypt* (over the deep sea). HUFFELD, however, and EWALD explain them of bringing back into the power of Israel their fugitive enemies from all their places of refuge, from Bashan eastward and the Sea westward, and delivering them up into their hands for condign punishment, 'that their foot may be dipped in the blood of their enemies, and the tongue of their dogs in the same,' v.23,—an explanation which, of course, suits well with David's time, but hardly with the days of the Captivity.

386. HUFFELD's arguments, therefore, to prove the later origin of this Psalm, are in our judgment to be reversed, as indicating rather its *earlier* composition. And we may now recur with more confidence to the usual supposition, which connects it with the removal of the Ark in David's time to Mount Zion,—the occasion which, as HUFFELD himself says, 'most immediately presents itself,' and 'gives incontestably the best sense' for it, nay, 'is the *only* one which suits' certain features of the Psalm. Not without reason, then, as it seems to us, DE WETTE 'reckons this Psalm among the *oldest* relics of Hebrew Poetry, of the highest originality.'

387. EWALD, who supposes Ps.lxviii to have been written 'at the dedication of the second Temple,' observes as follows:—

'It bears all the marks of a song not flowing out of an instantaneous impulse and inspiration, but composed with design and much skill for a *certain end*' [the bringing up of the Ark?]. p.297. 'It seems as if the poet had felt himself unequal to produce so lofty a song from his own resources; for the most beautiful and forcible passages in it are, as it were, flowers picked from old songs, which we in part find elsewhere in the O. T., and in part must suppose to have been once in existence. The whole is rather compiled out of a number of striking passages of older songs, as a new work firmly put together; and since many ancient passages are very abrupt, (as being known, perhaps, to the singers,) the explanation is often difficult. Where, however, we have the easily-recognised peculiar additions of the poet himself, there we see generally this later time plainly appear in the ideas, c.4,6,20,32, as well as in the *language*. So that whoever considers this double nature of the contents, and then the whole character of the Psalm, will not easily persuade himself that it dates from the time of the first dedication of the Temple under Solomon, or, generally, that it was composed earlier than the time when the second Temple

was built. In an historical point of view also it is worthy of note that in v.28 only *four* lay-tribes are named as coming to the Temple, which in Solomon's time has no meaning. And we learn from this that already, 511 B.C., not only Benjamin and Judah, but also Zebulun and Naphtali, that is, inhabitants of northern Palestine and Galilee, attended the Temple on Zion.' p.298.

Ans. As to the latter point, the explanation, which we have given above (391,v.e) seems much more natural. But, with respect to the *later* 'ideas' and 'language,' for which EWALD gives certain references, the following are the passages in question as translated by himself.

(i) v.4, 'Sing unto Elohim, sing praises to His Name;

Make a path for Him who travels through the desert,

Named Jah, and rejoice before Him.'

Here a reference is supposed to the *later* Isaiah, who writes:—

xl.3, 'Prepare ye the way of Jehovah,
Make—straight in the desert a highway for our God,'—

where the Hebrew words for 'path' and 'highway' come from the same root.

lvii.14, 'Cast ye up, cast ye up, prepare ye the way;

Take up the stumbling-block out, of the way of my people.'

lxii.10, 'Cast up, cast up, the highway,

Gather up the stones, lift up a standard for the people.'

But in these two passages the path is to be made for the *people*, in the Psalm for *Elohim*. The expression seems to have been proverbial; but, if copied at all, the *later* Isaiah may have copied from the Psalm.

(ii) v.6, 'Elohim brings again home the dispersed;

The prisoners He sets free in gladness and wealth;

The rebellious only abide in the waste.'

Here again, a reference is supposed to—Is.lviii.7, 'And that thou bring home the poor that are cast out.'

(iii) v.20, 'Elohim is to us an Elohim for salvation;

And Jehovah Adonai has even from death a way of escape [for us].'

(iv) v.32,33, 'Ye kingdoms of the earth, sing unto Elohim!

Sing praises to Adonai!'

It is difficult to see what signs of a later date are contained in these words. I have shown above (385,v.b) that the expressions in v.32 rather indicate the contrary.

The only other additional argument which EWALD produces, to fix the composition of this Psalm in a late age, is that the expression first quoted from v.20, 'Jehovah Adonai has even a way of escape from death,' can only refer to the deliverance from the Captivity. But surely such a reference is neither necessary in this case, nor probable.

388. EWALD translates v.30,31, thus:

'Restrain the beast of the reeds (E.V. *marg.*).
The host of bulls with the calves of the people,

That hastens on with pieces of silver;

Scatter the people that delight in war;
That so nobles may come out of Egypt,
And Cush (Ethiopia) in haste lift up his hands unto God.'

And he observes, p.304, 'The wild reed-beast (*lion* or *tiger*, that is, the great King), who with the host of bulls (mighty ones, chiefs), and the calves (weaker forces) of the people, hastens through fear to bring homage in silver pieces, but, whilst he does this simply from fear, must first be punished and instructed, is, perhaps, a description of the then existing warlike *Persian* kingdom, whose symbol is the Euphrates and Tigris, rivers on whose reedy banks lions abound.'

But it can scarcely be thought that this Psalmist, writing during the Captivity, was thinking of the vast Persian Empire being subjected in this way to the restored kingdom of Israel. If the 'beast of the reeds' is really the lion of the Euphrates and Tigris, it seems more reasonable to suppose that David was thinking of the forces of the *Assyrian* Empire, to the borders of which his own dominions are supposed to have reached, since Solomon is said to have 'had dominion over all on this side of the river (Euphrates),' 1K.iv.24, and we do not read of his making the conquest of these regions *himself*, so that he must have inherited the sovereignty, such as it was, from his father David. In that case, 'the troop of *bulls*' might very well represent the Assyrian captains. But it is hardly conceivable that even David, in the height of his glory, should have thought of Assyria becoming tributary to himself, or hurrying in fear to bring silver-pieces to the Temple.

Accordingly, HUFFELD draws attention to the fact, that the above translation disturbs completely the *parallelism* of the Hebrew poetry of the third and fourth lines, in which, in fact, there exists no parallelism of expression at present. He understands, also, (with OLS. and others), the 'reed-beast' to be the *crocodile*, or, perhaps, the *hippopotamus*, as the symbol of Egypt, and translates the two lines in question as follows:—

'Subject to thyself the rapacious of silver;
Scatter the people that delight in war.'

But v.31, as we have said, seems rather to imply that the princes of Egypt and Ethiopia would come with their presents to the Temple in a *friendly* way. However this may be, and whether the *Egyptian* or *Assyrian* king be meant by the 'reed-beast,' or, perhaps, the *Syrian* king of Zobah, Hadadezer, 'whom David smote, as he went to recover his border at the river Euphrates,' 2S.viii.3, the reference is certainly quite as intelligible, if written in the days of David, as in the time of the Captivity, or rather, much more natural and intelligible.

In v.9, the 'plentiful rain' seems to refer to the 'manna,' which was 'rained from heaven' upon them, E.xvi.4, Ps.lxxviii.24; and in v.10, instead of 'Thy congregation hath dwelt therein,' with HUFFELD should be read, 'Thy creatures ('the quails') settled down among it (the host).'

389. HENGSTENBERG makes the following remarks:—

Modern criticism has attacked also this

Psalm. Many, with EWALD at their head, would bring it down to a period after the Captivity,—a mistake which may well fill the mind with astonishment! The character of the language, and of the description, is sufficient to prove this. BÖTTCHER says, 'From its archaic language, its impressive descriptions, its fresh, powerful, tone of poetry, it belongs assuredly to the most remote age of Hebrew poetry;' and HIRTIG remarks, 'Before everything else the Psalm, to an attentive reader, conveys the impression of the highest originality. . . The poem may be pronounced with confidence to be as remarkable for its antiquity as for its originality.' The idea of EWALD, which he makes use of to counteract these considerations, viz. that the Psalm is made up of a series of splendid passages from poems now lost, must be characterised as merely an arbitrary one, at least so long as not one single passage can be pointed out, as borrowed from any of those pieces at present in our possession, which were composed after the time of David.

But the reasons drawn from the *matters of fact*, referred to in the Psalm are much more decisive. Here it is of great importance to note that, c.27, Zabulon and Naphtali take part in the procession, next after Judah and Benjamin. After the Captivity, some of the descendants of the ten tribes might be found united with Judah; but assuredly there could be no such thing as the distinct tribes of Zabulon and Naphtali with their 'princes.' During the whole period, when the two divided kingdoms existed in a state of juxtaposition to each other, there could have been no union between Benjamin and Judah and Zabulon and Naphtali; and, even supposing that they were sometimes united, by which HIRTIG would interpret c.27, yet, apart from the consideration that, next to Judah, Ephraim was the tribe that would have been named, and that the naming of the northern and southern tribes is equivalent to naming a part instead of the whole, especially when Ps.lx.7 is compared, —'Gilead is mine, Manasseh is mine; Ephraim also is the strength of my head; Judah is my lawgiver,'—it is utterly impossible that these tribes could ever have marched in company as part of a triumphal procession to the Temple at Jerusalem.

We must, moreover, go higher than the division of the kingdom, to the time of David. For under Solomon there was no such war and victory as the Psalm before us refers to. Further, the epithets applied to Judah and Benjamin in c.27 can be explained only from the relations which existed in the time of David. The mention also of *Egypt*, as representing the power of the heathen world, shows that the Psalm was composed before the rise of the great Asiatic monarchies, especially the Assyrian (rather before their coming into contact with Israel, for Semiramis reigned 1209 B.C., 160 years before David came to the throne). Israel, too, appears everywhere as a warlike and victorious nation, comp. especially c.21-23; and an event such as that which, according to c.18, formed the subject-matter of the Psalm, could not have taken place subsequent to the Captivity.

The reasons which have been urged against

the Davidic authorship of the Psalm are very trifling. By 'temple' is here meant, in the first instance, the holy tabernacle on Zion; and the temple of Solomon is to be considered as its continuation. Comp. Ps.v.7,xlviii.9, lxxv.4. That in c.80,31, there are no traces whatever of a hostile relation to Egypt, which did not exist in David's time, and that Egypt is named simply as representing the might of the World as separated from God, which it still did in David's time, and continued to do until the rise [or extension] of the great Assyrian monarchy, is evident from the circumstance that Cush, which never was in a state of hostility to Israel, is named next after Egypt.

390. With reference to the strong Elohistic character of this Psalm, HENGSTENBERG observes, and this is all that he observes, ii.p.339,—

Instead of *Jehovah*, David uses *Elohim*; and this name is the one which is generally used throughout the Psalm. *Jehovah* occurs only twice, c.16,20, and *Jah* twice, c.4,18. The reason of this lies in the misuse of the name *Jehovah*, which changed the name, that was itself the stronger, into the weaker (!) In such passages *Jehovah* is in the back-ground, and the simple *Elohim* is equivalent to *Jehovah Elohim*; comp. the *Jah Elohim* in c.18 (!)

391. We have now shown that in these three Psalms, which there is good reason for assigning, from the internal evidence of their contents, to the earlier part of David's life, the Name 'Jehovah' is either not used at all, or not used as the common, popular, familiar name for the Deity.

Surely our own explanation of the phenomenon, which is too remarkable not to be noticed, is the most natural, and, indeed, as it seems to us, the only rational explanation of it.

392. We have next to consider whether there are any Psalms, which are apparently to be ascribed to the same part of David's life, and which do contain the name *Jehovah*, employed freely as the common name for the Deity.

Here, then, we are met by the two excepted cases to which reference has been already made in (350) viz. Ps. xxxiv and Ps.cxlii.

393. Ps.xxxiv is entitled 'A Psalm of David, when he changed his behaviour before Abimelech, who drove him away, and he departed.' Abimelech here stands, no doubt, for Achish: and this Psalm, supposing the title to be correct, would have been written in the twenty-seventh year of David's life, and yet it contains *Jehovah* sixteen times,

and Elohim *not once*,—contrary to all our other experience.

394. Upon this I remark as follows:—

(i) As already observed, we cannot depend upon the Title in any case, unless it be supported by the contents of the Psalm.

(ii) HENGSTENBERG, who insists very strongly upon the general 'correctness and originality of the Titles,' (see his note on Ps. xxx.1.) comments, however, in this case as follows, note on Ps. xxxiv.1:—

'It is not, however, to be imagined that David composed the Psalm, when immediately threatened by danger. In opposition to any such idea we have the *quiet* tone which pervades it; whereas all the Psalms, which were immediately called forth by a particular occasion, are characterised by a great deal more of emotion. Besides which, we have the unquestionably predominant effort to draw consolation and instruction for the Church from his own personal experience. Finally, we have the *alphabetical arrangement*, which never occurs in those Psalms, which consist of an expression of feelings immediately called forth by a particular object, but always in those, in which the prevailing design is to edify others.

The fact is, that David, when on some occasion, in the subsequent part of his history, his mind became filled with lively emotions, arising from the recollections of his wonderful escape, in reference to which he even here says, 'I will praise Jehovah *at all times*, His praise shall be *continually* in my lips,' made it the groundwork of a treasure of edification for the use of the godly in all ages.'

HENGSTENBERG has here admitted all that is necessary to confirm our view of the case, *viz.* that this Psalm, if written by David at all, must have been written at a *later* period—it may be a *much* later period—of his life than the title would imply.

395. But there seems no reason to believe that this Psalm was written with any reference at all to David's escape from Abimelech or Achish. There is nothing whatever in its contents to bear out such a supposition. As HENGSTENBERG says, so calm and *artificial* a Psalm could not possibly have been written at a moment of extreme peril. And David passed through so many dangers in the course of his life, that it is very unlikely, to say the least of it, that he would be still referring back in later days to this particular occasion, as one of special peril and deliverance, even if the Title would allow of such an explanation of its meaning, which, honestly interpreted, it certainly will not.

396. The Title being thus shown to

be inaccurate, we can only form conjectures as to the authorship of this Psalm, from its actual contents; and these give us no reason for ascribing it to David at all. It may well be the thanksgiving of *any* pious writer of *any* age,—probably, however, of a man well advanced in years, since we read, v.11,—

'Come ye children, hearken unto me, I will teach you the fear of Jehovah,'—

which would have hardly suited David at the age of twenty-seven, or for many years after. And we actually have a Psalm composed by David, according to its Title, on this very occasion, Ps. lvi, and in a very different tone,—one of anguish and fear, quite suitable to it; and in this we have, as we might expect, Elohim *nine* times, Jehovah *once*.

397. Again Ps. cxlii is entitled 'Maschil of David, a prayer when he was in the cave;' and it contains Jehovah *three* times, Elohim *not once*.

On this I remark:—

(i) There is nothing whatever in the contents of this Psalm, which helps to fix it to this occasion.

(ii) We have here also a Psalm composed by David 'while in the cave,' Ps. lvii, and this, as we might expect, contains Elohim *seven* times, Jehovah *not once*.

(iii) It is most unlikely that, *on the very same occasion*, David should have written two Psalms, in one of which he never uses the word Jehovah, while in the other he never uses Elohim.

(iv) As we have good reason to suppose that in the earlier part of his reign he *did* write Psalms without Jehovah, *e.g.*, Ps. lx, and Ps. lxviii, we conclude, until other evidence is produced to the contrary, that the title of Ps. lvii is most likely to be genuine, and that of Ps. cxlii fictitious.

398. And so writes HENGSTENBERG, the great defender of the genuineness of the Titles, iii. p. 517.

That the situation indicated in the superscription was *not* the proper occasion of the Psalm, but that David here only applies what he then experienced for the edification of others, appears not simply from the expression Maschil = 'an instruction,' in the front of the superscription, out of which the following words, 'when he was in the cave,' derive their more definite import, but still more from the fact, that the Psalm stands in close contact with the rest of the cycle of which it forms a part.

David sees in his desperate condition, 'when he was in the cave,' a type of the future condition of his race and of the Church. His cave-reflections he sets before them as an instruction. When it might come with them to

an extremity, (this is the posture of affairs contemplated)—and such must come, for it cannot go otherwise with the son than with the father, they too must have their Saul to withstand)—they should still not despair, but pour out their complaint before the Lord.

399. In short, the very circumstance, that these two Psalms contain the name Jehovah so often, to the absolute exclusion of Elohim, is surely a clear indication that they cannot be ranked with the Psalms which we have been hitherto considering, and which were written at an earlier period of David's life. If written by David at all, of which there is no sign whatever, they must, we may conclude, have been written *towards the close of his life*.

400. For it cannot be said that the peculiarity, which we have noticed in certain earlier Psalms of David, arose from some idiosyncrasy of his own mind,—so that, while his predecessors and successors used freely the name Jehovah, David himself, for some reason, refrained from using it as frequently as the name Elohim all his life long. At least, we shall find that certain Psalms, apparently composed by him, according to their contents, as well as their titles, *towards the end of his life*, exhibit a phenomenon the exact reverse of that which we have already observed, and are decidedly *Jehovistic*, so that sometimes the name Elohim does not even occur at all in them.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE REMAINING ELOHISTIC PSALMS.

401. THAT the reader may have the whole case before him, we shall now give a table of the five books of Psalms, marking, as before, with an asterisk those Psalms which are ascribed by their Titles to David. We use, also, as before, the letters E. for Elohim, God, J. for Jehovah, LORD, and A. for Adonai, Lord: but we do not reckon any instances, where Elohim is evidently used for 'gods' or 'princes,' or where it is used in cases in which Jehovah could *not* have been used, as 'my Elohim,' 'thy Elohim,' &c., or where both Jehovah and Elohim are used together, as 'Jehovah Elohim,'

'Jehovah my Elohim.' We here take account only of those which show that *the writers made choice of the name which they would use for the Deity.*

BOOK I.

Ps.	E.	J.	A.	Ps.	E.	J.	A.
1	0	2	0	*22	0	6	1
2	0	3	1	*23	0	2	0
*3	1	6	0	*24	0	6	0
*4	0	5	0	*25	1	10	0
*5	2	5	0	*26	0	6	0
*6	0	8	0	*27	0	13	0
*7	4	5	0	*28	0	5	0
*8	0	2	2	*29	1	18	0
*9	1	9	0	*30	0	8	0
10	4	5	0	*31	1	10	0
*11	0	5	0	*32	0	4	0
*12	0	5	0	33	0	13	0
*13	0	2	0	*34	0	16	0
*14	3	4	0	*35	0	7	3
*15	0	2	0	*36	2	2	0
*16	1	4	1	*37	0	15	1
*17	1	3	0	*38	0	2	3
*18	4	15	0	*39	0	2	1
*19	1	7	0	*40	0	8	1
*20	0	5	0	*41	0	6	0
*21	0	4	0				

BOOK II.

Ps.	E.	J.	A.	Ps.	E.	J.	A.
42	9	1	0	*58	2	1	0
43	5	0	0	*59	4	2	1
44	4	0	1	*60	5	0	0
45	3	0	0	*61	3	0	0
46	5	3	0	*62	7	0	1
47	7	2	0	*63	3	0	0
48	5	2	0	*64	3	1	0
49	2	0	0	*65	2	0	0
50	9	1	0	66	7	0	1
*51	5	0	1	67	5	0	0
*52	5	0	0	*68	27	3	7
*53	7	0	0	*69	8	5	1
*54	4	1	1	*70	3	2	0
*55	6	2	1	71	6	3	2
*56	9	1	0	72	1	0	0
*57	7	0	1				

BOOK III.

Ps.	E.	J.	A.	Ps.	E.	J.	A.
73	5	1	2	82	2	0	0
74	5	1	0	83	3	2	0
75	2	1	0				
76	2	0	0	84	3	5	0
77	9	1	2	85	1	4	0
78	15	2	1	*86	3	4	7
79	1	1	1	87	1	2	0
80	3	0	0	88	0	4	0
81	1	1	0	89	1	10	2

BOOK IV.

Ps.	E.	J.	A.	Ps.	E.	J.	A.
90	1	1	1	99	1	3	0
91	0	2	0	100	1	4	0
92	0	7	0	*101	0	2	0
93	0	5	0	102	0	8	0
94	0	10	0	*103	0	11	0
95	1	3	0	104	1	9	0
96	0	11	0	105	0	5	0
97	0	6	1	106	2	9	0
98	0	6	0				

BOOK V.

Ps.	E.	J.	A.	Ps.	E.	J.	A.
107	1	12	0	129	0	3	0
*108	6	1	0	130	0	5	3
*109	0	6	1	*131	0	2	0
*110	0	3	1	132	0	6	0
111	0	5	0	*133	0	1	0
112	0	3	0	134	0	5	0
113	0	7	0	135	0	19	1
114	0	0	1	136	0	1	1
115	0	13	0	137	0	2	0
116	0	16	0	*138	0	6	0
117	0	3	0	*139	3	3	0
118	1	23	0	*140	0	7	1
119	0	24	0	*141	0	3	0
120	0	2	0	*142	0	3	0
121	0	5	0	*143	0	4	0
*122	0	3	0	*144	1	4	0
123	0	1	0	*145	0	9	0
*124	0	4	0	146	0	10	0
125	0	4	0	147	0	7	1
126	0	4	0	148	0	6	0
127	0	3	0	149	1	4	0
128	0	3	0	150	1	3	0

402. We obtain the following results from the above Table:—

(i) In Book I, almost all the Psalms of which are ascribed to David, the use of Jehovah is, *in every instance*, very much more common than that of Elohim. The former occurs 265 times in the book; the latter 27 times: that is, Jehovah occurs nearly *ten* times to Elohim *once*.

(ii) In Book II, *in every instance*, the reverse is the case; Elohim is very

much more common than Jehovah. The former occurs, in the whole book, 178 times, the latter, 30 times: that is, Elohim occurs *six* times to Jehovah *once*.

(iii) In the first eleven Psalms of Book III, which form together one small collection, being all entitled Psalms of Asaph, the use of Elohim also preponderates over that of Jehovah, but not so decisively. The former occurs 48 times, the latter, 10 times: that is, Elohim occurs *five* times to Jehovah *once*.

In the remaining Psalms of Book III the reverse is the case: Jehovah occurs 29 times, Elohim 9 times: that is, Jehovah occurs *three* times to Elohim *once*.

(iv) In Book IV the use of Jehovah preponderates decidedly *in every instance*. It occurs altogether 103 times, Elohim 7 times: that is, Jehovah occurs more than *fifteen* times to Elohim *once*.

(v) In Book V the same is the case, but much more remarkably, except in one instance, Ps.cviii. Omitting this Psalm, Jehovah occurs 262 times, Elohim 8 times: that is, Jehovah occurs *thirty-three* times to Elohim *once*.

403. We may collect the above briefly into one view, as follows:—

Book I	. . . contains . . .	Jehovah <i>ten</i> times to	Elohim <i>once</i>
Book II	Elohim <i>six</i> . . .	Jehovah <i>once</i> .
Book III	{ Psalms of Asaph . . .	Elohim <i>five</i> . . .	Jehovah <i>once</i> .
	{ Other Psalms . . .	Jehovah <i>three</i> . . .	Elohim <i>once</i> .
Book IV	Jehovah <i>fifteen</i> . . .	Elohim <i>once</i> .
Book V	Jehovah <i>thirty-three</i> . . .	Elohim <i>once</i> .

It is plain that the above results cannot be accidental.

404. We have already seen that of the Psalms of Book II, all of which are so decidedly Elohist, eighteen are ascribed to David, of which three, at least, were very probably written by him, or for him, and all *may* have been written by him, for anything that appears to the contrary. The three in question appear to have been composed in the *middle* part of his life; and others are assigned by their Titles,—perhaps with reason,—to a yet *earlier* time. It is possible also that *all* the Psalms of Book II may belong to the age of David. Let us now consider the eleven Elohist Psalms of Asaph in Book III.

405. We have already examined one 'Psalm of Asaph,' Ps.1, and shown that it may, very probably, be referred to the age of David. But expositors usually assume that many Psalms of this 'Asaph' collection in Book III were manifestly written during or after the Babylonish Captivity. Thus, says the note in *Bagster's Bible*, Ps.lxxiv is 'evidently a lamentation over the Temple destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar,' and Ps.lxxvii is 'allowed by the best judges to have been written during the Babylonian Captivity;' and Ps.lxxix is 'supposed, with much probability, to have been written on the destruction of the City and Temple of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar,' and Ps.lxxx is 'generally supposed to have been written

during the Babylonian Captivity,' and as to Ps.lxxxi, 'the most probable opinion is that it was sung at the dedication of the Second Temple.'

406. We may demur, however, to the above conclusions with respect to some of the above Psalms.

Ps.lxxiv was probably written after the destruction of Jerusalem, to which event the expressions in v.3-7 seem very plainly to refer—'The enemy hath done wickedly in the Sanctuary,'—'They have cast fire into Thy Sanctuary; they have defiled the dwelling-place of Thy Name to the ground.' That these words cannot be referred to the destruction of the Tabernacle at Shiloh appears from v.2, 'this Mount Zion, wherein Thou hast dwelt.'

So, too, Ps.lxxix must have been written after the destruction of Jerusalem, as appears by the language of v.1-3, 'O God, the heathen are come into Thine inheritance; Thy holy Temple have they defiled; they have laid Jerusalem on heaps. The dead bodies of Thy servants have they given to be meat unto the fowls of the heaven, the flesh of Thy saints unto the beasts of the earth. Their blood have they shed like water round about Jerusalem; and there was none to bury them.' These words are quoted in 1Macc.vii.17.

On the other hand, Ps.lxxv contains no distinct signs of time, but may possibly have been written by David before he came to the throne, as some expressions seem to imply, e.g. v.2, 'When I shall receive the Congregation, I shall judge uprightly,' v.10, 'All the horns of the wicked also will I cut off.'

Ps.lxxvi may also have been written by David. The phrases in v.1, 'His name is great in Israel,' and v.6, 'O God of Jacob,' seem to imply a time when the people was undivided; while the language in v.1, 'In Judah is God known,' and in v.2, 'In Salem also is His Tabernacle, and His dwelling-place in Zion,' show that it could not have been written before the time of David. Lastly, the martial tone of v.3,5,6,12, restricts it to his days, rather than Solomon's.

407. As some of the above are private Psalms, written, it would seem, by some royal personage, and written certainly at a very different age from others of this collection, which refer to the Captivity, it would rather appear that this set is called 'The Psalms of Asaph,' because the collection belonged to the Asaph family, though some of them may have been written by their ancestor Asaph, who lived in the days of David. We find here, however, in this Asaph collection, some very late Psalms, in which the same phenomenon occurs as in those Psalms of David which we have just been considering, —viz. a preponderance of the name

Elohim, though not in the same degree.

408. This accords also with the fact that, in the book of Ezra we have Elohim 97 times, Jehovah 37 times, and in that of Nehemiah, Elohim 74 times, Jehovah 17 times,—contrary to all the data of the other historical books. It would almost seem as if, after their long sojourn as captives in a strange land, when Israel no longer existed as a nation, they had begun to discontinue the use of the *national* Name for the Divine Being. However this may be, we find the later Prophets using the word freely again,—Haggai (J.35,E.3), Zechariah (J.132,E.12), Malachi (J.47,E.8). At a still later date, superstitious scruples prevailed so far, as to prevent the name Jehovah from being used at all. It is not found in the whole book of Ecclesiastes, and only in one chapter of Daniel, chap.ix.

409. There are some critics who assign many of the Psalms to the age of the Maccabees. But, at present, we see no sufficient reason for believing that any of these Psalms of Asaph, or any others in the whole book of Psalms, are later than the time of Nehemiah, who probably first edited them in their present form, in accordance with the statement in 2Macc.ii.13, that he,—

'Founding a library, gathered together the acts of the Kings, and of the Prophets, and of David, &c.'

410. It is remarkable that not one of the Psalms is ascribed to one of the great Prophets, as Samuel, Isaiah, or Jeremiah, the latter of whom must surely have written many in his time, which are very probably preserved in the collection, though not assigned to him by name. Thus, Ps.xxxi may be one of Jeremiah's, as appears from the following resemblances:—

(i) v.13, *Magor missabib* = 'fear on every side,' as in Jer.vi.25, xx.3,4,10, xvi.5, xlix.29, Lam.ii.22,—nowhere else in the Bible;

(ii) v.13, 'I have heard the slander of many: fear is on every side,' as in Jer.xx.10;

(iii) v.1,17, 'I shall not be ashamed,' as in Jer.xvii.18;

(iv) v.2, 'Bow down the ear,' as in Jer.vii.24,26,xl.8,xvii.23,xxv.4,xxxiv.14,xxxv.15,xliv.5;

(v) v.5, 'Jehovah, God of Truth,' as in Jer.x,10, nowhere else in the Bible;

(vi) v.10, 'Grief,' the same Heb. word as in Jer.viii.18,xx.18,xxxi.13,xlv.3;

- (vii) v.10, 'Sighing,' the same Heb. word as in Jer.xiv.3, Lam.i.22;
 (viii) v.10, 'My strength faileth me,' as in Lam.i.14;
 (ix) v.12, 'Like a broken vessel,' as in Jer.xxii.28, li.34;
 (x) v.22, 'Supplications,' the same Heb. word as in Jer.iii.21, xxxi.9.

CHAPTER XV.

THE JEHOVISTIC PSALMS CONSIDERED.

411. We have seen that all the Psalms in Book II, together with the eleven Psalms of Asaph in Book III, are decidedly Elohistic. All the remaining Psalms appear to be Jehovistic with one single exception, Ps.cviii (E.6,J.1). But this is evidently compounded of parts of the two Elohistic Psalms, lvii and lx, with one or two slight variations, the most noticeable being that Adonai, in Ps.lvii.9, is changed to Jehovah in Ps.cviii.3, that is, in the *later* edition, since, of course, the two complete Psalms existed before—probably *long* before—the composite Psalm was constructed.

412. Of the Jehovistic Psalms, *fifty-five* are ascribed to David; and it will be found, on reference to the Table in (401), that in these the name Jehovah occurs *ten* times to Elohim *once*, while in *thirty-eight* of them Elohim does not occur at all, as the distinctive Name, employed by *choice* for the Deity.

Now, as already observed, it is incredible, according to the ordinary laws of the human mind, that David should, in the *very same part of his life*, have written a number of Psalms with Elohim occurring on the average *six* times to Jehovah once, in several of which Jehovah does not occur at all, and another number of Psalms, in which Jehovah occurs on the average *ten* times to Elohim once, and in very many of which Elohim does not occur at all. Allowing that in either set there may be many Psalms, which have been incorrectly ascribed to David, the argument holds good with regard to the remainder. As *some* Elohistic Psalms at all events—Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii—were very probably written by David in the *earlier* and *middle* parts of his life, we may reasonably conclude that, if any of these Jehovistic Psalms really belong

to him, they can only have been written in the *last* part of his life, when, according to our view, the name Jehovah had become more familiar to himself, and better known to the people.

413. Accordingly, as far as we can depend upon the Titles, supported by the consideration of the contents, we find this to be the case. The following *four* Psalms are ascribed by their Titles to the *latter* part of David's life.

(i) Ps.iii (J.6,E.1) when David 'fled from Absalom,' in the *sixty-third* year of his life. HENGSTENBERG, however, agrees with LUTHER in considering, that, from the artificial construction of this Psalm, it must have been written at even a later date than the event to which it is supposed to refer. It speaks in r.4 of 'Jehovah's holy hill,' which points either to the Tabernacle or the Temple on Mount Zion, and, therefore, does not fix the Psalm to David's time.

(ii) Ps.vii (J.5,E.4), 'concerning the words of Cush the Benjamite,' whom LUTHER and others identify with Shimai, the son of Gera, the Benjamite, who insulted David on the same occasion, 2S.xvi.7,8, and whom David charged his son Solomon 'not to hold guiltless,' but to 'bring down his hoar hair to the grave with blood,' 1K.ii.8,9. HENGSTENBERG, while he agrees with LUTHER, and with most Jewish expositors, in regarding the word Cush as being not a proper name, but an epithet, 'Ethiopian,' used metaphorically of a 'man of a black heart,' understands it, however, of some unknown calumniator of David in the time of Saul. There is nothing in the Psalm itself to decide the question.

(iii) Ps.xviii (J.15,E.4), when 'David was delivered from all his enemies and from the hand of Saul.'

The last words of this title might seem to point to an earlier period, when he had only been recently delivered from Saul's hand.

I copy, however, on this point the following note of HENGSTENBERG:—

'We are told in the superscription that David sang this Psalm, after that Jehovah had delivered him from all his enemies. The Psalm is thus designated, not as having arisen from some special occasion, but as a general song of praise, for all the grace and the assistance, which he had received from God all his life long, as a collection of the thanksgivings which David had uttered from time to time on particular occasions,—a great Hallelujah, with which he retired from the theatre of life. In 2S.xxii this Psalm is expressly connected with the end of David's life, immediately before his 'last words,' which are presently after given in chap.xxiii. With this design the matter of the Psalm entirely agrees. In it the Psalmist thanks God, not for any single deliverance, but having throughout before his eyes a great whole of gracious administrations, an entire life rich with experience of the loving-kindness of God.'

Thus this Psalm also, if written by David at all, was written at the close of his life.

(iv) Ps.xxx (J.8,E.0) was composed,

according to the Title, 'for the dedication of the House of David.' This Title also might seem to point to the time, when David erected the Tabernacle on Mount Zion, and brought up the Ark to Jerusalem, in the *fortieth* year of his life. But on this point again HENGSTENBERG observes:

'The House, clearly, is the House of God, the Temple. And the Title indicates that this Psalm was sung at the dedication by David of the site of the future Temple, as recorded in 2S.xxiv and 1Ch.xxi.'

He then supports his statement by reference to the contents of the Psalm, which, certainly do not at all correspond with the circumstances under which David's Tabernacle was consecrated, but agree with the history in the above two passages. And he quotes with reference to the site in question, 1Ch.xxii.1,— 'Then David said, *This is the House of Jehovah Elohim*, and this is the Altar for the burnt-offering for Israel.' Thus, according to HENGSTENBERG, this Psalm also was written in the *sixty-eighth* year of David's life.

414. The above are all the Jehovistic Psalms, ascribed to David, whose Titles mark the time of their composition, except Ps.xlii, the title of which we have shown to be erroneous (397). As before observed, it cannot be regarded as by any means *certain* that the above Titles are correct, or that *all* or *any* of the above Psalms are really David's. It is possible that some of them are. Still some doubt, as to *any* of the Jehovistic Psalms being David's, is caused by the fact, that the 'last words' of David, as given in 2S.xxiii.1-7, which have all the appearance of being genuine and which, in tone and character, are very like those Elohist Psalms, which we know to be his, are also Elohist, containing Elohim *four* times and Jehovah *once*.

415. But, as far as these Titles are of any value, as far as their statements are confirmed by any internal evidences from their contents, they help us to maintain the ground already taken. They show that all the Psalms in question, and, therefore, we may justly infer, in the absence of plain proof to the contrary, any other decidedly *Jehovistic* Psalms, which may really belong to David, whether ascribed to him or not, were written, not in the earlier or middle part of his life, when his compositions, as we have seen, were decidedly Elohist, but towards the close of it.

416. In the larger edition, we have

examined carefully in detail all the Psalms of Books I,III,IV,V, whether ascribed to David or not, which exhibit in their contents any indications of the times at which they were composed. The result of our examination is that there is not a single Jehovistic Psalm, which there is any reasonable ground for assigning to the earlier part of David's life. There is no evidence—such as that which seems to mark Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii as really David's—which enables us to say with any approach to certainty, that any decidedly Jehovistic Psalm was written by David at all.

417. But, even admitting many Jehovistic Psalms to be David's on the very uncertain warrant of their Titles only, yet all of these *may* be assigned, and some of them *must* be assigned, to the later part of his reign, at the time of the rebellion of Absalom, in the *sixty-third* year of his life, or at a time still later. On the other hand, we have had before us strong, and, as it seems to us, conclusive, evidence, that in the earlier and middle parts of his life he wrote certainly *some* Psalms—and if so, then, perhaps, *many*—which are decidedly Elohist.

418. Hence, whether such Jehovistic Psalms were composed by David or not, it is certain that, if David wrote those earlier Psalms, *e.g.* Ps.lxviii (E.27,J.3, A.7), he could not have had such an idea of the sacredness of the Name Jehovah, and of the paramount privilege and duty of using it in obedience to the Divine command, as the Pentateuch, upon the traditionary view of its historical character, would lead us to expect,—at all events, in the case of a man so pious and well-trained as David, and one who had been from his youth up in closest intimacy with the Prophet Samuel. It seems absolutely impossible that, while almost all other persons, as the history teaches,—Eli, 1S.ii.24,25, and Samuel, 1S.xii, and Jonathan, 1S.xx.12-23—more common persons also, as Naomi and Ruth, R.i, Boaz and his reapers, R.ii.4, Hannah, 1S.ii.1-10, Abigail, 1S.xxv.26-31,—nay, even the heathen Philistines, 1S.vi.2,8, xxix.6,—were using freely the sacred

Name of Jehovah, yet David himself used it so sparingly that in several of his Psalms it appears not at all.

419. It is true, the *history* puts the name in David's mouth much more frequently than Elohim, 1S.xxiv.6,10, 12,15(J.8,E.0), xxvi.9-24(J.15,E.0)—that is to say, the history represents David as using constantly the name Jehovah, and scarcely the name Elohim at all, *at the very time* when he was hiding in the wilderness, and writing, apparently, Psalm after Psalm, in which Elohim occurs continually, and Jehovah scarcely at all. Nay, the history makes the Philistine king Achish swear familiarly by Jehovah, 1S.xxix.6, 'Surely, as Jehovah liveth, thou hast been upright.'

420. But this can only be regarded as one sign, among others, that the history in the Books of Samuel was composed at a later date, when the name Jehovah was undoubtedly in common use, and was, therefore, put by the writer in the mouth of every one. David's own Psalms are, surely, the best possible proof of the actual state of things at the time when he lived. And the simple fact that David wrote *one* such Psalm as Ps.lx or Ps.lxviii. in the *earlier* part of his life, would be enough to establish the point now in question, provided that no Psalm could be produced of opposite character—that is, no *decidedly Jehovistic* Psalm—which contains strong internal evidence of having been written by David in the same part of his life. I have looked for such a Psalm in vain.

421. And let it be observed once more that the argument would hold good with respect to any of the Psalms in Book II, which bear distinct signs of an early date, even if they had not been written by David. There *are* those Psalms; and they are, as it appears to me, undeniably *early* Psalms,—that is to say, such a Psalm as Ps.lx must, as I conclude from its internal character, have been written in David's time. For this was the *only* time that can be thought of, in the history of the Hebrew monarchy, when it could be said that Gilead and Manasseh, Ephraim and Judah, were all under

one sway, except the time of Solomon; and the references to Moab, Edom, and Philistia, in v.8, as well as the whole tone of the Psalm, do not agree with the age of Solomon, but *do* with the age of David.

422. This Psalm, then, *viz.* Ps.lx, and the others of a similar kind, must, it would seem, have been written by some pious person or persons of those days, whether David or not. And all those, who maintain the traditionary view, will, I imagine, heartily agree in this: But then the writer, or writers, of these Psalms, it is plain, could not have been in the habit, at that time, of using familiarly the name Jehovah. It could not, therefore, have been commonly employed in the devotions of pious men in those days. And, if so, it could not have been freely in use *before* those days; and, above all, it could not have been known and recognised by these pious men, as the Name which Almighty God Himself had revealed to Moses, and had specially sanctioned as the Name, by which He would be hereafter known in Israel, saying,—
'This is My Name for ever, and this is My memorial unto all generations.' E.iii.15.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE JEHOVISTIC NAMES IN THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

423. THE inference from the above seems to be plain, in complete accordance with our previous supposition, *viz.* that the word, Jehovah, had been but newly formed, or, at least, newly adopted and introduced, by some, great, wise, and patriotic master-mind—very probably SAMUEL'S—at the time when David came to the throne, with the special purpose, probably, of consolidating and maintaining the civil and religious unity of the Hebrew tribes, under the new experiment of the kingdom. As the facts, which we have been here considering, so far from being in any way at variance with the conclusion, to which we had already come on other clear grounds, as to the unhistorical character of the Mosaic narrative, are, on the contrary, quite in accordance with it, we cannot, as

before said, suppose that the Name Jehovah really originated in the way described in E.iii and E.vi. Yet, we repeat, it must have been introduced at some period or other of the history of the Hebrew tribes, as the word Unkulunkulu must have come into use in some intelligible and natural manner, if we only knew the story of it, among the Zulus, or as the word uDio is now being introduced among them.

424. And this view seems to be confirmed, when we examine the names mentioned in the historical books, which follow the Pentateuch. We have already seen (299) that not only the Elohist, but even the Jehovist has abstained from introducing names compounded with Jehovah in the course of the Mosaic story. They occur only in *two* cases, Joshua and Jochebed. Moses himself is described as making the change of Hoshea to Jehoshua in a very marked manner, N.xii.16; and Jochebed, as we have seen some reason to believe (302), is, most probably, a later interpolation.

425. The stories in the Book of Judges are, apparently, founded upon some real traditions; and, though in some places they are evidently exaggerated, and in others they have assumed a legendary form, and the chronology, throughout, is the despair of the 'reconciling' school of theologians, yet the heroes, whose exploits are there described, seem to have been real characters, and their names, in most cases, may be supposed to be genuine. In this book, we have Othniel, i.13, and Penuel, viii.8, (the name of a place), and in R.i.2 we have Elimelech; but among all the numerous Judges and their fathers we find no other names compounded with Elohim.

426. There are, however, *four* names in the book of Judges, which *may* be supposed to be compounded with Jehovah, viz. Joash, vi.11, the father, and Jotham, ix.5, the son, of Gideon, Micah, xvii.1, and Jonathan, xviii.30.

Thus Micah is by some considered to be an abridged form of Micaiah, 'Who is like Jehovah?' while by others it is distinguished from the latter name, and explained to mean, 'poor,' or 'smitten,' or 'who is here?'

This last is the explanation of the name in Bishop PARKER's Bible, where also the meaning of Jotham is said to be 'perfect,' but that of Joash 'fire of Jehovah.' Any Hebrew scholar, however, will know that the name 'Joash' *may* be formed precisely in the same way as 'Jotham,' or as 'Joseph,' without any reference to the name Jehovah.

427. Hence it must be considered doubtful, whether the first three of the above four names are really compounded with Jehovah at all,—so doubtful, that no stress can be laid upon them in argument against such positive facts as have been already produced. But the fourth, Jonathan = 'Jehovah gives,' does certainly contain the name Jehovah; and we must examine how far our theory is affected by this fact.

428. If we could be reasonably certain that this was a *bonâ fide* historical name, and that a man, called Jonathan, was actually 'Priest to the tribe of Dan,' Ju.xviii.30, *before* the time of Samuel, it would follow, of course, that the name Jehovah was not first introduced by Samuel. But then we are met by the fact that this is the *only* name in the whole history of the Judges, with respect to which it can be confidently maintained that it is compounded with Jehovah. If we joined with it the three doubtful names above discussed, we should still be confronted with the fact that, among the multitude of names of persons and places, in Numbers, Joshua, Judges, Ruth, many of them compounded with the Divine Name, we find no trace of other names of this kind, save Joshua and Jochebed; whereas, according to the Jehovist, the name Jehovah had been used freely from the first, and, according to another part of the story, even if it first came into use at the time of the Exodus, yet Moses himself had already set the example of compounding names with it, by changing Hoshea to Joshua. Let us, therefore, consider somewhat more closely this case of 'Jonathan.'

429. Now, first, it must be observed that this name does not occur in the 'Book of Judges,' properly so called, but only in one of the two episodic narratives, which are attached to the end of it, xvii-xxi,—appendices, as it were, to the Book itself, and very pos-

sibly, therefore, not written by the same hand as that which composed the main portion of the principal story. At all events, we have, in these two episodes, distinct marks of the time at which they were written, a time later, at all events, than the days of Saul's entering on the kingdom. This is implied by the expression in xvii.6,—

'In those days there was no king in Israel; but every man did that which was right in his own eyes,'—

which is repeated in xviii.1, xix.1, xxi.25; and more especially by the statement in xviii.30,31, that,—

'Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, he and his son were priests to the tribe of Dan, until the day of the Captivity of the land. And they set up Micah's graven image, which he had made, all the time that the House of God was in Shiloh.'

430. The 'Captivity' here mentioned is supposed by some to refer to the time when the Ark was taken captive in Eli's days, after which calamity the House of God ceased to be any longer at Shiloh. Even according to this view, this story must have been written *after*, and the language seems to imply, *some time after*, that event, and in days when there was a king ruling in Israel, and comparative order under his government. In other words, it may have been written in the latter days of Samuel, and, in that case, it would probably be one of the productions of his historical school; but it was certainly not composed at an earlier age.

431. If, then, we adopt the above supposition as to the date of the composition of this narrative, the name Jehovah had, according to our view, long been published, and had been, in fact, already introduced into the names of Samuel's own two sons, Joel and Abijah, as well as in some other names, as Ahiah, Zeruiah, &c., of which we shall speak presently. It is quite possible, then, in accordance with our view, that a writer of this age might have introduced such a name as the above, compounded with Jehovah, supposing that it is not a *bond fide* historical name, the name of a person who actually lived in an earlier age than that of Samuel.

432. But is this account of 'Jona-

than to be relied on as historically true? We have hitherto taken it for granted that the above interpretation of the words 'captivity of the land,' is, perhaps the true one. But the expression is a strange one to be used of the 'capture of the Ark,' as there is no indication that the land was taken captive at that time. If even the *central* part about Shiloh was overrun for a time by the Philistine armies, it seems very unlikely that the invasion should have reached the extreme northern corner, or that even, if it did, it should have had any effect in stopping the idolatries of the tribe of Dan.

433. Hence it seems much more natural to interpret the words in their plain and obvious meaning with reference to the 'Captivity of the land' of Israel in the time of Pekah, 2K.xv.29, when Tiglath-Pileser, king of Assyria, took captive 'all Gilead and Galilee, and all the land of Naphtali,' (the district in which the town of Dan was situated, and that part of the tribe of Dan with which we are here concerned,) more than three centuries and a half after the capture of the Ark and the death of Eli. And so say several eminent critics, who, however, refer the expression rather to a still later date, that of the Captivity of the Ten Tribes by Shalmaneser. In either case it would follow that this statement in Ju.xviii.30 is a very much later interpolation in the original story.

434. And that v.30 is an interpolation seems to be indicated by the manner in which it is introduced. The original writer would hardly have repeated himself in this way in two consecutive verses,—

'and the children of Dan set up for themselves the graven image,' v.30,
'and they set up for themselves the graven image, which Micah had made,' v.31.

It will be observed also that in v.30 the Levite, whom the Danites had engaged as priest, and of whom the story has been speaking all along, suddenly disappears, and without any word of explanation, Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Manasseh, (or of Moses, as in the margin,) abruptly

takes his place. It may be said that this Jonathan, if he really was, as the margin has it, a descendant of Moses, must have been a Levite, and may have been the Levite of the story in Ju.xvii,xviii. But, if so, it is very strange that he should never have been named before, but have been merely introduced as—

‘A young man out of Bethlehem-Judah, of the family of Judah, who was a Levite,’ xvii.7.

435. It would seem then that some later writer, living after the ‘Captivity’ of the kingdom of Israel, meant to convey some information as to the family of priests, who had long conducted the idolatrous worship of the tribe of Dan, from time immemorial down to the period of the Captivity. It can hardly be believed, however, that from the time of the Judges, down to that of the Captivity, for four centuries at least, one family of priests continued to officiate at Dan, or that the genealogy of these idolatrous priests could be traced up with certainty to so distant a parentage, far back into the rude times of the Judges, by one who wrote nearly a century after the extinction of their office.

436. It is quite possible, however, that in some later age, as *e.g.* in the time of Jeroboam,—who ‘made two calves of gold,’ and ‘set the one in Bethel, and the other put he in Dan,’ 1K.xii.28,29, and who, therefore, evidently remodelled, at all events, the idolatrous worship at Dan,—such a priest as Jonathan may really have been stationed at Dan, and his family may have retained the priesthood till the last. The interpolator may have been aware of the fact that they traced back their office to such a distant time, 250 years before the ‘Captivity of the land’; and he may have inserted this verse as a record of the circumstance, connecting this latter priesthood with the story of the first establishment of idolatrous worship at Dan. In the age of Jeroboam, of course, there is no reason why the name of the priest at Dan should not have been Jonathan.

437. The original writer seems to have meant to say in v.31 that the Danites

continued idolaters all along, neglecting the worship of the central sanctuary, while other Israelites frequented the ‘House of God in Shiloh.’ He does not say that the children of Dan ceased to be idolaters, when that ‘House of God’ was destroyed. Nor, in fact, is there any reason to suppose that they did abandon their idolatrous practices, or that they were at all likely to have been affected by that event, as they lived far away from this central sanctuary, and seem to have had no connection whatever with it.

438. Upon the whole, then, we conclude that there is no single instance in the authentic history, from the time of Moses downwards to that of Samuel, which can be appealed to, as distinctly showing that the name Jehovah was used in the formation of proper names in those days,—except, as before, the cases of Joshua and Jochebed. And yet, according to the Jehovist, the one name was, from the very first, as commonly in use as the other; and, according to the Chronicler, names compounded with Jehovah, were common from the age of Jacob downwards, and were even given to converts from heathenism, as in the case of Bithijah, the daughter of Pharaoh, 1Ch.iv.18.

439. Even if Samuel, or the Elohist, whoever he may have been, did not himself introduce this Name, yet there must have been some reason for the earnestness with which he evidently seeks to commend it to his people by means of the solemn story of its introduction in E.vi. It may have been already in use,—introduced, perhaps, first in the time of Moses,—but not very commonly employed, as the *entire absence*, or, in any case, the *extreme paucity*, of names compounded with it undoubtedly proves; and the Elohist may have done his best in this way to make it a household word in Israel. My own conviction, however, from the accumulated evidence of various kinds before us, is that SAMUEL was the first to introduce the Name, perhaps from some Egyptian or, more probably, Phœnician source.

440. In Ju.v, however, which contains the Song of Deborah, we have

some phenomena which require attentive consideration.

'Jehovah, when Thou wentest out of Seir,
When Thou marchest out of the field of Edom,

The earth trembled, and the heavens dropped,
The clouds also dropped water:

The mountains melted from before Jehovah,
That Sinai from before Jehovah, the God of Israel.' v.4,5.

441. Here we have a plain reference to the *story*, at all events, of the Exodus and the giving of the Law under Sinai, if not to the actual record of that story, which is now in our hands. And in this passage, as well as throughout the song, the word Jehovah is familiarly used. It is important, therefore, to determine, if we can, in what age this Song was really written. It professes, of course, to be the Song actually uttered by 'Deborah and Barak;' though the very fact, that the two are joined together in singing it, rather militates against the notion of its genuineness, and seems to indicate, at all events, that it is an artistic composition, and not the unpremeditated effusion of the moment of triumph.

442. And, certainly, there are parts of the Song, which appear, at first sight, to imply that it was composed at a very early date, perhaps in the age to which its contents refer, and not later, at all events, than the days of Samuel.

(i) *Judah* is not mentioned at all, which seems to correspond to a time before David's accession to the throne,—before even the 30,000 men of Judah followed the standard of Saul, 1S.xi.8.

(ii) *Levi* is not named, nor is there any reference whatever, throughout the Song, to the Priesthood or the Sanctuary.

This also corresponds to a time, earlier than the days of David, in whose reign the Levites, after the bringing up of the Ark, were called into greater activity, and into a more prominent position, than they appear to have occupied during the time of the Judges,—the Levites, as a body, being never once mentioned throughout the whole book of Judges.

(iii) The expression in v.10, 'Ye that ride on white asses,' suits the same early time; but then, as such asses or mules were used by chief persons, 1S.xxv.20, 2S.xvi.2, xvii.23, xix.26, 2S.xlii.29, 1K.i.33, 38, 44, down even to the time of Solomon, this argument cannot be regarded as a *proof* of the great antiquity of the Song.

443. On the other hand, we must observe—

(i) The song is thoroughly *Jehovistic* as regards the use of the Divine Name (E.2.J.13): and it is inconceivable that, if the word Jeho-

vah was used so freely at that time, David should have used it so sparingly, as we have seen he did, till, at least, a late period of his life.

(ii) The language in v.8, 'Was there a shield or spear seen among forty thousand in Israel?' seems to refer to the early times of Saul and Samuel, 1S.xlii.19-22.

(iii) Some expressions of the story are *identical* with those of Ps.lxviii, as is exhibited below by the *italics* of the English version.

Ju.v.

v.3, To Jehovah I will sing, I will sing praise to Jehovah.

v.4, Jehovah, in Thy going out from Seir,
*In Thy marching from the field of Edom,
The earth trembled, the heavens also dropped,
The clouds also dropped water.*

v.5, *Before Jehovah the mountains melted,
That Sinai before Jehovah, the Elohim of Israel.*

Ps.lxviii.

v.4, Sing to Elohim, sing praise to His Name.

v.7, Elohim, in Thy going out before Thy people,

In Thy marching in the wilderness,

v.8, *The earth trembled, the heavens too dropped,
Before Elohim,*

That Sinai before Elohim, the Elohim of Israel.

Compare, also, 'Lead thy captivity captive,' v.12, with 'Thou hast led captivity captive,' Ps.lxviii.18.

444. From the above it seems to be certain that either the Psalmist was acquainted with the Song of Deborah, and borrowed expressions from it, or that the writer of that song drew his ideas from the Psalms of David. Which, then, of these two poems was first written?

We reply, without hesitation, *the Psalm*. For it is far more probable that a later writer may have changed Elohim into Jehovah, than that the Psalmist—as we believe, David—should have changed Jehovah, the covenant-name of the God of Israel, into Elohim: more especially in the last clause, in which he has actually written 'before *Elohim*, the Elohim of Israel,' where the other, has 'before *Jehovah*, the Elohim of Israel.'

445. If any say, the Psalm was, perhaps, written at a very late date, when pious men for some reason refrained from using the name Jehovah (414), and therefore the Jehovah of Ju.v.5 has been changed into Elohim, we answer that this supposition is at once negatived by the fact that the Psalmist *does* use the name Jehovah, three times, and does not refrain from

using it altogether. It is, therefore, most unlikely that he would *change* the formula, 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Israel,' into 'Elohim, the Elohim of Israel.' He might have written the latter *originally* in the case supposed; but it is very unlikely that he would have modified the other form, if he actually had it before him.

446. Besides which, v.7,8, of the Psalm are manifestly part of the context. Our argument, therefore, is this. Of the two phrases, 'Elohim, the Elohim of Israel,' and 'Jehovah, the Elohim of Israel,' it seems certain that the former was the original expression, and that the latter was derived from it. But the former belongs to the *Psalm*, which was, consequently, older than the *Song*.

There is an appearance also in the Song of an *expansion* of the words of the Psalm; thus the expressions 'from Seir,' 'from the field of Edom,' of the Song, seem equivalent to the simple words, 'in the wilderness,' of the Psalmist; and so also the phrases 'The clouds also dropped water,' 'The mountains melted,' are merely amplifications of the older language.

447. We conclude, then, that the 'Song of Deborah' was written *after* Ps.lxviii, that is, after the middle part of David's life, perhaps towards the close of it, two or three centuries after the time of Barak and Deborah, by a writer who, except in the free use of the word Jehovah, has produced an admirable imitation of an ancient song, a 'Lay of Ancient Israel,' and thrown himself thoroughly into the spirit of the age which he describes.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE JEHOVISTIC NAMES IN THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL.

448. We now pass on to the First Book of Samuel. Here, throughout the first chapters, we do not meet with a single name compounded with Jehovah; though we find *Elkanah* and *Elihu*, i.1, *Samuel*, ii.18, *Eleazar*, vii.1. In vi.18 we read—

'which stone remaineth in the field of Joshua the Bethshemite *unto this day*;'—

where the name Joshua is compounded

with Jehovah, but evidently belongs to a man living in the time when this passage was written, which is shown, by the expression '*unto this day*,' to have been a considerably later time than that of the event in question, that is, than the time of Samuel.

449. Then we read,—

'when Samuel was *old*, he made his sons judges over Israel; now the name of his first-born was *Joel*, and the name of his second, *Abiah*,' viii.1,2.

It is certainly remarkable that the name of Samuel's first-born son should be *Joel*, which Gesenius explains to mean, 'Jehovah is Elohim,' and which, in fact, is merely a contraction of the compound name, Jehovah-Elohim. This suits singularly with our view that Samuel was introducing—or, at all events, commending—the new name, at the very time when his son had this name given to him. The name of Samuel's second son was *Abiah*, i.e. 'Jehovah is my father.' Then we find *Abiel*, ix.1; but *Aphiah* in the same verse is not compounded with Jehovah.

450. We next meet with *Jonathan*, 'Jehovah gave,' the son of Saul, xiii.2. Now Saul himself was a young man ix.2, when he sought his father's asses, and first made acquaintance personally with Samuel; and at that time Samuel was old, and had already made his sons judges over Israel, viii.1,2. Hence the Name Jehovah had been published certainly, judging only from *their* names, for twenty or thirty years at least; and there is no reason why Saul's son should not have borne a name compounded with it, after the example of the Prophet's two sons. This is said, supposing that Jonathan was already grown up, to be a youth of, at least, seventeen or eighteen, when he was placed in command of a thousand of his father's troops, xiii.2, two years after Saul came to the throne.

451. But even if he had been then only *seventeen* years old, (which we can hardly suppose), he would have been twenty-five at the birth of David, and *fifty-five*, when he fell at Gilboa, and when David, aged *thirty*, mourned over him thus:—

'I am distressed for thee, my brother Jonathan; very pleasant hast thou been unto me;

thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women.' 2S.i.19-27.

This song has all the appearance of being genuine. And it can scarcely be believed that so romantic an attachment would have existed between David and one old enough to have been his father.

452. In fact, the chronology of the earlier part of Saul's life is very confused and uncertain. The account in 1S.ix, of Saul's first meeting with Samuel, would seem to imply that he was then but a young man, who could not have had a son fourteen years old. Nor is it possible to read the account of the death of Saul, and the words of David's lamentation over him,—

'Saul and Jonathan were lovely and pleasant in their lives, and in their deaths they were not divided; they were swifter than eagles, they were stronger than lions,' 2S.i.23—and believe that Saul was then about *seventy-five* years old, (as he must have been if Jonathan was fifty-five,) and that he was about seventy, when he hunted David in the wilderness.

453. It seems plain, then, that the account of Jonathan's exploit in 1S. xiii.2, &c. must refer to a much later part of Saul's life than it there appears to do. And now there is nothing to prevent our supposing that Saul was really a young man, when he had his first interview with Samuel, as the story throughout seems to imply, and, probably, unmarried. If, however, we suppose that Jonathan was born *after* Saul's intimacy with the Prophet,—perhaps, even after he had come to the throne,—we shall have Jonathan and David more nearly contemporaries, and it will be much more natural and probable that David should have married Jonathan's sister Michal. In that case, it would be easy to account for the name of Jonathan having been given to Saul's eldest son, after Saul's communications with Samuel,—more especially since Saul himself had 'prophesied' amidst the company of Prophets, x.10, in other words, had joined in chanting their Psalms, in which, most probably, the Name itself, Jehovah, occurred.

454. We next meet with the name

of *Ahiah*, 'the son of Ahitub, Ichabod's brother,' xiv.3. Ichabod, we are told, was born at a time when all Israel already 'knew that Samuel was established to be a Prophet of Jehovah,' iv.20,—when, therefore, Samuel was grown up to manhood. We have no means of knowing how much older Ahitub was than his brother; but we may assume that he was not much older, and was, consequently, in the generation junior to that of Samuel,—of about the same age, in fact, as Samuel's own sons. From the close relations, in which Samuel lived with Eli and his family, it can scarcely be doubted that both Ahitub and Ichabod, after their parents' death, came much under his influence,—probably were trained up by himself. Thus it is easy to account for Ahitub also giving to his son a name compounded with the new word Jehovah, and a name which has a strange resemblance to that of Samuel's younger son. That was *Abiah*, 'Jehovah is my father'; this is *Ahiah* or, rather, *Akhiah*, 'Jehovah is my brother,'—for, strange as it may appear, this seems to be the only meaning that can be assigned to the word.

455. After this we meet with *Eliab*, xvi.6, and *Adriel*, xviii.19: and then we have *Joab*, xxvi.6, son of *Zeruiah*, David's sister, 1Ch.ii.16, both of which names are compounded with Jehovah. Supposing *Zeruiah* to have been even ten years older than her youngest brother, David, still, at the time of her birth, Samuel's two sons, with the sacred Name mixed up in their names, were already old enough to have been set as judges over Israel. And, if *her* name contained Jehovah, it is natural enough that *her* son's should contain it. He may, in fact, have been called *Joab* in imitation of his uncle's name *Eliab*.

456. In 2Samuel we have several names compounded with Jehovah. We find *fourteen* compounded with *El*, viz. *Phaltiel*, iii.15,—four of David's sons, *Elishua*, v.15, *Elishama*, *Eliada*, *Eliphalet*, v.16,—*Ammiel*, xvii.27, *Elezar*, xxiii.9, *Kabzeel*, the name of a place, v.20. *Asahel* and *Ethan*, v.24, *Elka*, v.25, *Eliabba*, v.32, *Eliphalet* and *Eliam*, v.34,

But there are also *eleven* names compounded with Jehovah, viz. Adonijah and Shephatiah, David's fourth and fifth sons, iii.4, Jedidiah, a name given to Solomon, xii.25, Jonadab, David's nephew, xiii.3, Jonathan, the son of Abiathar, xv.27. Benaiah, Jehoiada, and Jehoshaphat, xx.23,24, another Benaiah, xxiii.30, Jonathan, v.32, and Uriah the Hittite, v.39. These seem all to have been younger men than David, and of about the same age as his eldest son, except Jehoiada, the father of Benaiah, who may have been about the age of David.

457. Thus we see that, in the time of David's manhood, it was not an unusual thing for parents to give their children names compounded with Jehovah. Since, therefore, wherever lists of names occur in the Pentateuch, we do not find a single name of this kind (except, as before, Joshua and Jochebed), it would seem that the author or authors, to whom such lists are due, could hardly have lived *in a much later age than this*. On the other hand, since, in David's earlier Psalms, nay, even in his 'last words,' we have had clear evidence, as it seems to us, that the name Jehovah was, at the time of his writing, not in such free popular use as the name Elohim, we infer that all the Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch were written *after* the time of David, or, at least, not before the latter part of his life.

458. Thus, then, even if it were conceivable that Moses should have written a story, about matters in which he was personally concerned, involving such contradictions, exaggerations, and impossibilities, as we have already had before us, yet the fact above noticed would alone be decisive against such a supposition. The great body of the Pentateuch, and all the other historical books which follow it, could not have been compiled until the Name Jehovah was in common popular use, and that, as we believe, was not till after, at all events, the middle of David's reign.

459. Whereas, on the other hand, the Elohist portions of the Pentateuch, which appear to have been composed, when the Name Jehovah was not in

common use, and with the very purpose of commending it to popular acceptance, must have been written during, or shortly before, the earlier part of David's life, when that word was only occasionally employed by him. Hence we may, with very good reason, abide by our supposition that they were written, very probably by the hand, or, at least, under the direction, and certainly in the time of SAMUEL.

460. And so writes HARTMANN, *Historisch-Kritische Forschungen*, p. 157:—

If all these phenomena lead us to assume a mutual relation between Phœnicia and Palestine in reference to religion, it cannot be deemed improbable to assume that the name Jehovah was derived from the same source, but was stamped with a peculiar, sacred, meaning, through its connection with the holiest ideas. If this conjecture is well-founded, then this name, at the earliest, can only have been transplanted into the religious language of the Israelites, *in the age of David*.

461. HENGSTENBERG, i.277, disposes of the above important point, in a note as follows:—

'What VON BOHLEN has adduced, in favour of his scheme of the first 'Rise of Jehovahism' in the days of David and Solomon, *scarcely deserves the name of argument* (!). He appeals to Proper Names compounded with Jehovah, which first came into use contemporaneously *with*, or else *after*, the days of David. Every one immediately thinks of Joshua; and VON BOHLEN does not forget, but naturally avails himself of, the fact, that he was originally called Hoshea. This is, indeed, correct; but, if the name of Joshua was not a product of the Mosaic age, if it had not been given him, as the Pentateuch informs us, by Moses himself, how did it obtain universal acceptance among the people? It would be carrying mythical notions to an extravagant length to maintain that the nation had never retained the right name of their distinguished commander-in-chief,—that he received a new name in the age of David or Solomon.'

Ans. According to our view, Joshua was only a mythical or, perhaps, legendary personage, whose second name, compounded with Jehovah, certainly originated in an age not earlier than that of Samuel. At all events, there is no evidence that this new name *was* popularised, that it ever did 'obtain universal acceptance,' that Joshua ever was a well-known, popular hero. His name is never once mentioned in the later history, or by any one of the Psalmists or Prophets, except in a reference to the book of Joshua, i.16.xvi.34.

'Yet let us now turn from what the author thought to that which escaped him, who so often asserted without examining, and that with inconceivable confidence. No small number of Proper Names, in the times preceding David, are compounded at the beginning with Jehovah. Thus Jochebed the mother of Moses, whose name certainly was not (?) of later

formation, Joash, the father of Gideon, Jotham, Gideon's youngest son, Jonathan, Priest of the Danites in the time of the Judges, another Jonathan, 1Ch.ii.32, and so several more [but only in the Chronicles.] Besides these, there are those names that stand on the same footing, which have an abbreviated Jehovah at the end, as Moriah, Ahijah, the son of Becher, the grandson of Benjamin [in Chronicles], Bithiah [in Chronicles], &c.'

Ans. We have already considered all these instances, that of Jochebed (308), Joash and Jotham, as well as Micah, not mentioned by HENGSTENBERG (432), Jonathan (433-442), Moriah (chap. ix), and the Chronicler's names (309-312), and we have seen that not one of them really militates against our theory.

'Thus much, however, is correct, that names compounded with Jehovah become much more frequent from the time of Samuel. [This is true according to the more authentic history, but not according to the Chronicler, who makes them quite as numerous long before the time of Moses.] But this lends no support to VON BOHLEN's view, and is easily explicable from facts, which the accredited history presents to us. Owing to the prevalent view in Israel of the close correspondence of names and things, it could not be otherwise than that the powerful theocratic excitement in the times of Samuel and David would create a demand for the composition of Proper Names with the theocratic name of God, Jehovah, and, what at first proceeded from living reasons, would in aftertimes (which leant upon that period, so splendid both externally and internally) be adopted from standing usage. What an effect the state of the public mind has on names has been exemplified clearly among ourselves by the relation of names, in an age of unbelief, to those of the preceding believing times. Since the Proper Names, compounded with Jehovah, had not yet had sufficient time to become naturalised, and since, in the period of the Judges, only a few living roots were in existence from which such names could be formed—[how can this be said, if there were so many names in the Mosaic age compounded with Elohim (303, 304)?],—we might expect beforehand not to find them very numerous at that time.'

Ans. But, according to the Chronicles, we do find them common enough from the time of Jacob downward. Setting aside, however, the Chronicler's statement as manifestly fictitious, we agree with HENGSTENBERG, (though looking at the matter from a very different point of view), that the 'powerful theocratic movement, in the times of Samuel, did create a demand for such names,' which, according to our view, that same age originated; and thus we also believe with him that such names had not yet had 'sufficient time to become naturalised.'

462. We have thus something like firm ground to stand upon, as the result of this inquiry, and can at once account for many of the strange phenomena, which we observe in the Pentateuch. The earliest portions of

it, including the account of the Exodus itself, or rather, as we shall see, *the first scanty sketch of it*, were written four hundred years, at least, after the supposed time of the Exodus, three hundred of which, according to the story, passed amidst the stormy and disorderly period of the Judges, which can only be compared with the worst times of Anglo-Saxon England.

463. The chronology, indeed, of the Judges is, notoriously, very confused and contradictory; and it is quite possible that a much shorter space of time than three hundred years may really have elapsed since the movement took place, which, as we believe, lay at the basis of the Elohist narrative. During that period, however, it seems very unlikely that any historical records were written, or, if written, were preserved,—preserved by whom? Later writers, at all events, mention no historians of earlier date than Samuel, Nathan, and Gad; so that whoever wrote the Book of Judges wrote, most probably, from the mere legends and traditions of the people.

464. Thus, then, it is not necessary to suppose that the narrative of Samuel is a pure fiction, an invention of the Prophet's own imagination,—in short, merely a 'pious fraud.' It is very possible that there may have been, as we have said, floating about in the memories of the Hebrew tribes, many legendary stories of their ancestors, and of former great events in their history,—how they once fled in a large body out of Egypt, under an eminent leader, such as Moses,—how they had been led through that 'great and terrible wilderness,' had encamped under the dreadful Mount, with its blackened peaks and precipices, as if they had been burnt with fire (74).—how they had lost themselves in the dreary waste, and struggled on through great sufferings, and many died, but the rest fought their way at last into the land of Canaan, and made good their footing among the tribes which they found there, by whom they were called Hebrews, that is, people who had 'crossed' the Jordan, or, perhaps, the Euphrates.

465. In fact, precisely the same expression is used by the natives of Natal in speaking of those Zulus who from time to time have been driven by fear, or have migrated for other reasons, from their native land lying to the north of the British colony, and 'crossed' the large frontier river, the Tugela, into the Natal district, either before or after it came under British rule. It is quite customary to speak of them, simply as *abawelayo*, 'people who have crossed,' or, perhaps, the movement may be more closely defined, 'who crossed with Umpande,' or whoever the principal person may have been.

466. It is conceivable that the recollections of that terrible march may have left indelible traces on the minds of the people, and may thus have been exaggerated, as is the case with legends generally, while circulated in their talk, and passed on by word of mouth, from sire to son, in the intervening age. In this way, natural facts may have been magnified into prodigies, and a few thousands multiplied into two millions of people. It is quite possible that the passage of the Red Sea, the manna, the quails, and other miracles, may thus have had a real historical foundation, as will be shown more fully in our critical review of the different Books of the Pentateuch.

467. And Samuel may have desired to collect these legends, as far as possible, and make them the basis of a narrative, by which he, being dead, might yet speak to them with a Prophet's voice, and, while rejected by them himself, as a ruler, might yet be able patriotically to help forward their civil and religious welfare under kingly government, and more especially under the rule of his favourite David, whose deep religious feeling accorded with his own sentiments so much more fully than the impetuous, arbitrary, character of Saul. His annual journeys of assize, when—'he went from year to year in circuit to Bethel, and Gilgal, and Mizpeh, and judged Israel in all those places,'—1S. vii. 16,

would have given him good opportunities for gathering such stories, as well as for knowing thoroughly the different parts and places of the country to which such

legends were attached. He may have spent a great part of his life, especially the latter part of it since Saul came to the throne (277), and he was himself relieved from the cares of government, in the elaboration of such a work as this, filling up from his own mind, we may conceive, the blanks left in such legendary accounts, and certainly imparting to them their high religious tone and spiritual character.

CHAPTER XVIII.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

468. THE preceding investigations have led us to the conclusion that the Pentateuch most probably *originated*, humanly speaking, in a noble effort of one illustrious man, in an early age of the Hebrew history, to train his people in the fear and faith of the Living God. For this purpose he appears to have adopted the form of a history, based upon the floating legends and traditions of the time, filling up the narrative, we may believe,—perhaps, to a large extent,—out of his own imagination, where those traditions failed him. In a yet later day, though still, probably, in the same age, and within the same circle of writers, the work thus begun, which was, perhaps, left in a very unfinished state, was taken up, as we suppose, and carried on in a similar spirit, by other prophetic or priestly writers. To SAMUEL, however, we ascribe the Elohistic story, which forms the groundwork of the whole, though comprising, as we shall show hereafter, but a very small portion of the present Pentateuch and book of Joshua.

469. But, in order to realise to ourselves in some measure the nature of such a work, as that which we here ascribe to Samuel, we may imagine such a man as Asser, in the time of King Alfred, sitting down to write an accurate account of events, which had happened four centuries before, when different tribes of Saxons, under Hengist and Horsa, and other famous leaders,—the old Saxons, Angles, Jutes, &c., all kindred tribes,—came over the sea at different times, in larger or smaller bodies, and took possession of

the land of Britain. Yet Samuel's sources of information, for the composition of such a history, must have been far less complete than those which the Anglo-Saxon author would have had before him, when writing was so common, and, midway between the times of Hengist and Alfred, Venerable Bede had composed his history. The Saxon Chronicler, however, has no difficulty in filling up a genealogy, and traces up that of Alfred through Odin and his progenitors to—

Bedwick, who was the son of Sceaf, who was the son of Noah; he was born in Noah's Ark! *Anglo-Saxon Chronicle*, Bohn's Ed. p.350.

470. In short, the same must be said of these old Hebrew annals as has been so justly observed of the records of our Anglo-Saxon times, (PEARSON, *Early and Middle Ages of England*, p.52):

These narratives, even stripped of palpable additions, are clearly not quite historical. . . The three hundred thousand Saxons of the British account are like the three keels of the Saxon narrative, a mythical number, underlying, perhaps, a real national division. Moreover, the dates assigned to the battles occur suspiciously at regular intervals of eight years. Now eight was a sacred number among the Saxons. It is probable, therefore, that the whole chronology of the war was constructed in the ninth century, or whenever the Saxon Chronicle was written. *But this uncertainty as to details, and numbers, and dates, throws an air of doubt over the whole history.*

471. It would seem that large additions were made to this unfinished historical sketch of Samuel by his disciples, such as NATHAN and GAD, or by some other prophetic or priestly writers of that and the following age; and these included the principal Jehovistic portions of Genesis, as well as the greater part of the present books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers. But though, as we believe, these portions of the Pentateuch were written in that age, the history, when carefully examined, gives no sign of the Pentateuch itself being in existence in the age of Samuel, David, or Solomon,—much less of the Levitical laws being in full operation, *known, honoured, revered, obeyed*, even *quoted or referred to*,—as the contents of a book, believed to be Mosaic and Divine, would certainly have been, at least, by the most pious persons of the day. We shall have occasion hereafter fully to discuss this question, and see

how far the actual historical facts, which may be gathered from the books of Samuel and Kings, and the writings of the Prophets, tend to confirm the above conclusions.

472. I must now, in conclusion, take account of two classes of objections, which will undoubtedly be made to the above results. First, it will be said, 'You will have us then believe that Samuel, Nathan, &c., were after all *deceivers*, who palmed upon their own countrymen, in the first instance, a gross fraud, which from that time to this has been believed to be the true Word of the Living God.' As one of my friends has observed, 'I would rather believe that two and two make five, than that such a man as SAMUEL could possibly have been guilty of so foul an offence against the laws of religious truth and common morality.'

473. I address myself here to those who believe that they are bound to use their faculties of mind, as well as of body, in the service of the God who gave them, and that they cannot truly glorify God by setting up a falsehood, and bowing down and worshipping an idol of their own making, though it be in the form of a Book, the best of books, which they believe to reflect the very image of the Divine Mind. And to such as these I reply, in the first place, 'It is not I, who require you to abandon the ordinary notion of the Mosaic authorship and antiquity of the Pentateuch. It is the TRUTH itself which does so.' It is impossible, as it appears to me, after a due consideration of the evidence, which has been brought forward in these pages—independently of that which will be set before the reader hereafter, if God spare me strength for the work—to maintain any longer that notion.

474. I believe that God calls upon us now in this age, in His Providence, as He did in the days of the Reformation, or of the first publication of Christianity, to make a complete revision of our religious views in this respect. And I believe that we shall best serve Him by giving ourselves reverently and devoutly, but piously and faithfully,—with a humble dependence on His help,

and a calm and fearless trust in His guidance,—to the consideration of this great question of our day. It was said to them of old,—

‘Thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine *heart*, and with all thy *soul*, and with all thy *strength*,’ D.vi.5.

It is Christianity which adds,—
‘and with all thy *mind*, and thy neighbour as thyself,’ Lu. x. 27,—

and which teaches us also that from the ‘Father of Lights’ cometh ‘*every good and perfect gift*,’ Jai.17, and that He holds us responsible for using them all.

475. A true Christian, then, is not at liberty to lay aside, as inconvenient or discomforting, any single *fact* of science, whether of critical or historical research, or of any other kind which God in His gracious Providence is pleased to bring before him. He dares not bury this talent in a napkin, and go about his business, in his own way, as if he had never heard it, as if it were nothing. He is bound to turn it to account in the service of his Great Creator, to consider carefully how far it is true, and to what extent it *must*, therefore, interfere with notions, which he had already, perhaps, registered as *certainties*, but upon insufficient evidence. This duty is laid especially on those who have received gifts of other kinds,—education, leisure, opportunity, and it may be, from peculiar circumstances, a special call for the work,—which many of their fellowmen have not, and which place them in more prominent positions, as leaders and guides of others.

476. We are bound, then, to consider carefully *what are the facts*, with respect to the composition of the Pentateuch, which a close critical investigation of the different books reveals to us. But here, in the next place, it is possible that a very wrong estimate may be formed on some points by a hasty judgment, from the conclusions to which our enquiry hitherto has led us, more especially with regard to the conduct and moral character of Samuel. There is not, as has been said repeatedly already, the slightest reason to believe that the whole story is a *pure fiction*—

that there was no residence of the Israelites in Egypt, no deliverance out of it.

477. Upon consideration of the whole question, it is impossible not to feel that some real movement out of Egypt in former days *must* lie at the base of the Elohistic story. It is almost inconceivable that such a narrative should have been written by Samuel, or anyone else, without some real tradition giving the hint for it. What motive, for instance, could the writer have had for taking his people down into Egypt, representing them as miserable slaves there, and bringing them out of Egypt into Canaan, unless he derived it from legendary recollections of some former residence of the Hebrews in Egypt under painful circumstances, and of some great deliverance?

478. If then, some centuries it may be, after such an event, a great mind, like that of SAMUEL, devoted itself to gathering up the legendary reminiscences of this great movement, which still survived among his people,—greatly modified, no doubt, exaggerated, and distorted, as they were passed on from age to age in the popular talk,—and if to these records of their national prime he endeavoured to give unity and substance, by connecting them into a continuous narrative, and fixing them down in written words for the use of his countrymen, is there anything immoral and dishonest in such an act, whether it be viewed from a merely *literary*, or a strictly *religious*, point of view,—provided only that we do not insist upon fastening upon the writer our own modern notions of what he actually did, and what he intended and really professed to do?

479. Thus, if our view be correct, as to the true origin of the first sketch of the story of the Exodus, we shall be very far indeed from characterising the act of SAMUEL, at all events, as an ‘impudent fraud.’ Rather, the person of the aged Seer will loom out from those ancient times with a grandeur and distinctness more remarkable than ever. Like our own king Alfred, he will have in that case to be regarded as the great regenerator of his people,

a model himself of intellectual activity and vigour, of patriotic zeal and religious earnestness. Viewed in this light, the Elohist narrative must be received with the respect and admiration of all ages, even if regarded only as a mere work of genius. Still more will it demand our veneration as containing the records of true religion in its earliest developments, and as having ministered so largely, in God's Providence, to the religious education of mankind.

480. It is true that the Elohist has set the example of introducing in his narrative the Divine Being Himself, as conversing with their forefathers and imparting laws to Moses,—though not, indeed, the minute directions of the ceremonial laws in Leviticus and Numbers; for these, as we believe, are all due to later writers. But, in this respect, he has only acted in conformity with the spirit of his age, and of his people, which recognised, in their common forms of language, a direct Divine interference with the affairs of men. The case, indeed, would have been different, if the writer had stated that these Divine communications had been made to *himself*, that God had spoken to *him*, in his own person, instead of to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and had revealed laws to *him* instead of to Moses. It would have been different also, if he had claimed, for all he wrote, *Divine Infallibility*,—if he had professed to have received these early records of the race by special inspiration, so that every part of the story which he recorded must be received with unquestioning faith as certainly true.

481. But there is not the slightest reason to suppose that the first writer of the story in the Pentateuch ever professed to be recording *infallible truth*, or even *actual, historical, truth*. He wrote certainly a narrative. But what indications are there that he published it at large, even to the people of his own time, as a record of *matter-of-fact, veracious, history*? Why may not Samuel have composed this narrative for the instruction and improvement of his pupils,—from which it would gradually find its way, no doubt, more or less freely, among the

people at large,—without ever pretending that it was any other than an historical *experiment*, an attempt to give them some account of the early annals of their tribes? In *later* days, it is true, this ancient work of Samuel's came to be regarded as infallibly Divine. But was it so regarded in the writer's days, or in the ages immediately following?

482. On the contrary, we find no sign of the Mosaic Law being venerated, obeyed, or even known, in many of its most remarkable features, till a much later time in the history. We shall enter into a full examination of this point hereafter, and show the very strong corroboration which our views derive from this consideration. For the present it may be sufficient to note that even the Ten Commandments, which one would have supposed would have been, as it were, household words in Israel, are never once quoted by any one of the Psalmists or Prophets. The Levites are only *once* mentioned in the Psalms, Ps.cxxxv.20, and once in (the later) Isaiah, lxi.21, thrice in one chapter of Jeremiah, xxxiii.18,21,22, and in no other of the Prophets before the Captivity. Aaron is mentioned *once* only, by all the Prophets, Mic.vi.4; Moses is named *twice* only before the Captivity, Jer.xv.1, Mic.vi.4, and referred to, though not named, in Hos. xii.13; Joshua is not mentioned by them at all.

483. But, if we will lay aside our own modern notions, of what Samuel *ought* to have been, and what he *ought* to have done; and merely regard him as a great statesman and lawgiver, imbued from his childhood with deep religious feelings, and having early awakened in him the strong conviction of the distinct Personal Presence of the Living God,—if we think of him as anxiously striving to convey the momentous truth, with which his own spirit was quickened, to the young men of his school, whom he had taken into closer intimacy with himself, and whom he hoped to influence for the permanent welfare of the whole community,—then the measures, which we suppose him to have taken for the purpose, will

appear to be very natural, and quite undeserving to be styled an 'impudent fraud.'

484. As we have said, the notion of his adopting this plan, of referring the institutions, which he wished to enforce, to the direct revelation of the Divine Being,—though he did not profess to have received them himself, but represented them as made of old to the fathers or leaders of the Hebrew people, to Abraham or Moses,—is quite at variance with the traditional view of the Divine origin and Infallible authority of this part of the Scriptures, and with the modern conceptions which are formed of the nature of Inspiration and the proper aim and object of Scripture writers. But the results of our investigations compel us to the conclusion that either SAMUEL himself, or some other devout writer of that age, *did* adopt it.

485. In this, however, there is nothing inconsistent with the belief that SAMUEL was a true man, a true servant of the Living God, in whose Name he spoke, and of whom he witnessed. Such Divine communications have been imagined by men of most devout and reverent minds, actuated by the highest and holiest motives, in all ages,—whether we consider the speeches ascribed to the Divine Being in the poems of Milton, or those which we find introduced in the Book of Enoch, a Book which is quoted as authentic in the Canonical Epistle of St. Jude, or that grand address which is put into the mouth of Jehovah himself in the Book of Job, xxxviii-xli, which few, probably, will maintain to have been literally uttered 'out of the whirlwind,' even though believing that the writer of the Book of Job composed this magnificent poem under special Divine Inspiration.

486. There is nothing therefore to prevent our believing that SAMUEL also, or the Elohist, whoever he may have been, was 'moved by the Holy Ghost,' while he strove to teach his people, by the examples of their forefathers,—set before them in a life-like story, full of moral and religious significance, though not historically true,—the duty of fearing God, and trusting in Him, and

loving and serving Him. There is nothing to prevent our receiving the narrative as bringing to us lessons of like significance, as being 'profitable for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction in righteousness.'

487. With Abraham, we too may be called to go forth, at the voice of Truth which is God's voice, into a strange land which we know not, but where He will assuredly meet with us and bless us, or to be ready to sacrifice, if need be, at the bidding of the same supreme authority, some dear object of our hope—perhaps, some cherished tenet of our faith—'accounting that God is able to raise it up, even from the dead,' to give us a brighter hope, and a surer ground of confidence in His Faithfulness and Love, than ever. Or, again, with Moses, we may have to be taught to stand before the gulf of difficulty, when the path of duty lies plainly *forward*, but there seems no passage in front, no way of escape to the right or to the left, and then to be able to say,—

'Fear not, stand still, and ye shall see the salvation of God.'

488. These particular acts may never have occurred: but similar acts *have* occurred, and *are* occurring daily. And these stand forth in the Mosaic narrative, as, indeed, does the whole march through the wilderness, as records of the writer's experience in the past, and types of the daily experience of mankind. In short, the Elohist narrative may be regarded as a series of 'parables,' based, as we have said, on legendary facts, though not historically true,—but pregnant with holy instruction for all ages.

489. We might have wished, indeed, that it were possible for us to suppose that the account of the revelation of the Name Jehovah, in E.vi, was also based upon legendary matter of fact,—that there were any clear signs of the existence of the word among the Hebrew tribes in an earlier age than that of SAMUEL. But the truth compels us to admit that there seems to be no such indications. On the contrary, the evidence before us appears to tend in the opposite direction, to fix the introduction of the Name as having occurred in the age,

and, therefore, we must suppose, by the act of SAMUEL. It should be borne in mind, however, that *we* very probably import into that Name, *JEHOVAH*, in the present day, a fulness and depth of meaning, which the Seer himself did not ascribe to it. In his mind, it was only the expression of the idea of the Living God, the God of Israel, in opposition to the dead idols of the heathen.

490. If SAMUEL had once set the example of this mode of composing the early history of the Hebrew people, it would, of course, be most easy and natural for his disciples in a later age to follow him,—more especially if, as might very naturally happen, the unfinished manuscript was left in their hands by their dying master, with the permission, or even the injunction, to complete and perfect it to the best of their power. The establishment of the Divine Service at the Tabernacle in David's time, and at the Temple in Solomon's, would give occasion for additions to be made of a ceremonial and ritualistic character; and, perhaps, for a succession of years, such accretions might grow to the original document in the hands of the Priests. Yet is there no sign that the laws thus laid down were *published* for general information, and actually enforced by the best of kings, or obeyed by those kings themselves or by the most devout of their people.

491. The Levitical laws seem rather to have served as a kind of *directory* for the Priests in the discharge of their duties in the Temple; and supplied information, we may suppose, for the instruction of pious worshippers, as in the command for a woman after childbirth to bring a lamb and a *young pigeon* or *turtle-dove*, L.xii.6, or in that for a *poor* man, after recovery from leprosy, to bring 'two *turtle-doves* or two *young pigeons*,' L.xiv.22,—a command which is expressly laid down, as for *the camp in the wilderness*, v.3,8, but which plainly betrays its character, as a law laid down in later days, by prescribing this act, which was impracticable in the wilderness.

492. In this form, the roll of the Mosaic story seems to have lain for nearly four centuries, kept, it may be,

in the Temple archives, in the possession of the Priests, and referred to, perhaps, occasionally, when information was desired, or an addition was to be made to it. But we find no tokens in the writings of the Prophets of that age, of any such familiar acquaintance with the contents of this ancient document, as would imply that it was well known and devoutly studied, even by them,—much less by the people,—though, according to the laws of the Pentateuch, every king was to copy it with his own hand, D.xvii.18, and it was to be read publicly every seven years to the whole assembled people at the Feast of Tabernacles, D.xxxi.10-13. On the contrary, in Josiah's days, as we learn from 2K.xxii, the pious king himself, as well as the people, was taken wholly by surprise by the discovery of the 'Book of the Law' in the Temple, and evidently was in complete ignorance of the nature of its contents, before he heard them.

493. But, some one, perhaps, may now say, 'Do you then take from us God's Word, the Bible?' I must reply again, 'Whatever is done, it is not *I*, but the TRUTH, which does it.' If the arguments, which I have advanced, are not really founded upon Truth, let them be set aside and thrown to the winds; but, if they are, we dare not, as servants of God, do this—we are bound to hear and to obey the Truth.

494. It may be then—rather, it is, as I believe undoubtedly—the fact, that God Himself, by the power of the Truth, will take from us in this age the Bible as an *idol*, which we have set up against His Will, to bow down to it and worship it. But, while He takes it away thus with the one hand, does He not also restore it to us with the other,—not to be put into the place of God, and served with idolatrous worship, but to be revered as a Book, the best of books, the work of living men like ourselves,—of men, I mean, in whose hearts the same human thoughts were stirring, the same hopes and fears were dwelling, the same gracious Spirit was operating, three thousand years ago, as now?

495. Is it nothing to know and feel

this, that in those remote ages our fellow-men breathed the same spiritual breath as we do now, lived the same spiritual life, and dreaded, as the consequence and judgment of sin, the same spiritual death? Is it nothing to know that whether Adam sinned or not, by eating the forbidden fruit in Paradise, whether Noah and his family were saved in the Ark or not, whether the cities of the plain were destroyed for their sins or not, yet *in the minds of our fellow-men*, whoever wrote those stories of old, there was as deep and true a conviction of the evil of sin, and its bitter, terrible, consequences, as we have now?

496. And on the other hand, is there no solid comfort in knowing that, to the minds of pious men in those days, as well as now, it was revealed that the heaven and the earth were the work of the great Creator, that the blessed light came forth by the Word of God, and man himself was made in his Maker's image? Do we not feel the bonds of our common humanity drawn yet more closely around us, when we see that in those days, as now, the Presence of God Himself was realised as near to every faithful soul, ready to strengthen, comfort, bless, or, if need be, to chasten,—nay, that to their eyes, as to ours, the gracious signs of nature were whispering of a bond between earth and heaven, and the bright beauty of the rainbow after the storm,—the simple fact that, notwithstanding all our sins, God still gives us power to see and enjoy His Goodness,—was regarded as a pledge of the continuance of His loving care for His creatures, an assurance of forgiveness and peace?

497. In this way, I repeat, the Bible becomes to us a human book, in which the thoughts of other hearts are opened to us, of men who lived in the ages long ago, and in circumstances very different from ours. And, for those who devoutly study it in this spirit, there will be ever-increasing joy and consolation, in beholding how the face of man answereth to face, under the teaching of the self-same Spirit, how the heart of the human race is really one in its religious consciousness,—in

its 'feeling after God,'—in its deep desires, which nothing of this world can satisfy,—in its sense of sin, which can only be relieved by confession and repentance,—in its assurance of fatherly, forgiving mercy, when sin is confessed and forsaken.

'When I kept silence, my bones waxed old, through my roaring all the day long; I acknowledged my sin unto Thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto the LORD, and Thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin.' Ps. xxxii. 3, 5.

498. Is, then, the Bible to be read like any other common book? In one sense, yes. It is to be read, like any other book, with the 'understanding' as well as with the 'heart.' We must not blindly shut our eyes to the real history of the composition of this book, to the legendary character of its earlier portions, to the manifest contradictions and impossibilities, which rise up at once, in every part of the story of the Exodus, if we persist in maintaining that it is a simple record of historical facts. We must regard it, then, as the work of men, of fellow-men, like ourselves, fighting the same good fight, on the side of God, and His Truth, against all manner of falsehood and evil, though fighting in their own primitive way, and without the light of that Christian teaching, which shines upon our warfare of to-day, and makes many things plain and clear to our eyes, which to them were still dark and uncertain.

499. But then, on the other hand, we must study the Bible with the *heart*, as well as with the *mind*. The Bible is not itself 'God's Word,' but assuredly 'God's Word' will be heard in the Bible, by all who will humbly and devoutly listen for it. As the Greeks have been endowed by the 'Father of Lights' with those special gifts in art and science and literature, which have made the works of their great masters in all ages the models for the imitation of mankind,—as the Roman has been distinguished in matters of law and government, and other nations have had their own peculiar endowments, for the common welfare of the race,—so, too, has the Hebrew mind had its own special gift from God.

500. For, while showing itself singularly defective in ancient days, (though with many grand exceptions in later times,) with respect to all matters of science, art, literature, and general politics, yet has the Hebrew race been quickened from the first, more than all others, with higher spiritual life, and endued with special gifts for the purpose of propagating that life to others. Throughout the Scriptures is this wonderful power exhibited, by which, with a few simple words, the springs of life within our own hearts are touched, and the whole inner man is stirred, and we 'taste the good Word of God, and the powers of the world to come.' The mighty voice of some great Prophet is still heard delivering its burden of righteous judgment and woe, against the national sins of modern times, as well as those of the days of old,—'Shall I not visit for these things, saith the LORD? Shall not my soul be avenged on such a nation as this?' The plaintive cries of some unknown Psalmist, his meek resignation, his patient hope,—or, it may be, his song of praise and thanksgiving,—still find their echoes in all true hearts, and are breathed afresh, day by day, from a thousand lips, as the most natural utterances of human beings, 'in all times of their wealth, in all times of their tribulation.'

501. Is it not thus, indeed, with us all? Do we not feel that there are living words in the Bible, which come home to us with a force, which no multitude of signs or wonders can strengthen, no diminution of them can impair? And are we not sure that those words, with which our spirits have been fed from our youth up until now, are quite independent of all the results of criticism?—that, as Bishop THIRLWALL has said,—

The numbers, migrations, wars, battles, conquests, and reverses of Israel have nothing in common with the teaching of Christ, with the way of salvation, with the fruits of the Spirit,—they belong to a totally different order of subjects,—they are not to be confounded with the spiritual revelations contained in the Old Testament, much less with that fulness of grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ?

502. Yes, truly, as it is written, *Heb. iv. 12*,—

'The Word of God is quick and powerful, and sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.'

Thank God! we have no need to 'examine the grounds,' and to 'weigh the evidence' of miracle and prophecy, in order to believe that in the Bible we have a record of a Divine Revelation, by which God's Word is spoken to the heart of man. But then the above apostolic description of the Word of God cannot possibly be applied to the mere letter of the histories in Genesis, or of the details of the construction of the Tabernacle in Exodus, or the minute directions for sacrifice in Leviticus, or the records of the numberings and marchings in Numbers—to the wars and conflicts in Samuel and Kings, to the genealogies in Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles.

503. I will here quote the words of the excellent Dr. GEDDES, a Roman Catholic Divine, in his *Critical Remarks* (A.D. 1800), I. p. vi.:—

The Gospel of Jesus is my religious code: His doctrines are my dearest delight: 'His yoke (to me) is easy, and His burden is light.' But this yoke I would not put on,—these doctrines I could not admire,—that Gospel I would not make my law,—if Reason, pure Reason, were not my prompter and preceptor. I willingly profess myself a sincere, though unworthy, disciple of Christ: *Christian* is my name, and *Catholic* my surname. Rather than renounce these glorious titles, I would shed my blood; but I would not shed a drop of it for what is neither Catholic nor Christian. Catholic Christianity I revere whenever I find it, and in whatsoever sect it dwells. But I cannot revere the loads of hay and stubble, which have been blended with its precious gems, and which still, in every sect with which I am acquainted, more or less tarnish or hide their lustre. I cannot revere metaphysical unintelligible creeds, nor blasphemous confessions of faith. I cannot revere persecution for the sake of conscience, nor tribunals that enforce authority by fire and faggot. I cannot revere formulas of faith made the test of loyalty, nor penal laws made the hedge of Church establishments. In short, I cannot revere any system of religion, that, for divine doctrines, teacheth the dictates of men, and, by the base intermixture of 'human traditions,' maketh 'the commandments of God of none effect.' This I say even of Christian systems; and shall I grant to systematic Judaism what I deny to systematic Christianity? Shall I disbelieve the pretended miracles, the spurious deeds, the forged characters, the lying legends, of the one, and give full credit to those of the other? May I,

blameless, examine the works of the Christian doctors and historians by the common rules of criticism, explode their sophistry, combat their rash assertions, arraign them of credulity, and even sometimes question their veracity,—and yet be obliged to consider every fragment of Hebrew Scripture, for a series of a thousand years, from Moses to Malachi,—every scrap of prophecy, poesy, minstrelsy, history, biography,—as the infallible communications of Heaven, oracles of Divine Truth? Truly, this is to require too much from credulity itself.

In the Hebrew Scriptures are many beauties, many excellent precepts, much sound morality,—and they deserve the attentive perusal of every scholar, every person of curiosity and taste. All those good things I admit, and admire, and would equally admire them in the writings of Plato, Tully, or Marcus Antoninus. But there are other things in great abundance, which I can neither admire nor admit, without renouncing common sense, and superseding reason,—a sacrifice which I am not disposed to make, for any writing in this world.

This language will, I doubt not, seem strange to the systematic Christian, who has founded his creed—not upon reason or common sense, but—on the prejudices of education, who is a Papist at Rome, a Lutheran at Leipsic, and a Calvinist at Geneva, a Prelatist in England, and a Presbyterian in Scotland, a Nestorian in Syria, in Armenia an Eutychian. For such local nominal Christians my 'Remarks' were not intended: they would spurn them with zealous indignation. But, if there be, as I trust there are, in each of those communions, men who have learned to think for themselves, in matters of faith as well as in matters of philosophy, and who are not Christians merely because they were born of Christian parents, and bred up in Christian principles, but because, on the most serious and mature examination, they find Christianity a rational—a most rational—religion, to such I address myself with confidence, and by such I expect to be listened to with patient candour.

To such I would say—It is time, it is full time, that Christianity should learn to walk alone, without Jewish leading-strings or Gentile go-carts. It is time that the pure spiritual religion of Jesus should throw aside all the tawdry cumbersome load of exotic ornaments, borrowed either from Judaism or Paganism,—from the temple of Jerusalem or the temples of Jupiter,—and reclathe herself in the white spotless robes, in which she was originally invested. It is time for her rational admirers to vindicate her chaste character from the aspersions of her professed enemies, and from the false praise of her pretended friends; for the false praise of her

pretended friends has been often more injurious to her reputation than the obloquy of her professed enemies;—or, rather, she has had no enemies, but because her pretended friends have exhibited her in a dress which she disclaims and despises. Strip her at once of this ungainly, meretricious garb; restore her to her primitive simplicity; and she will need only to be seen, to be admired, loved, idolised!

504. Reading the Bible in this spirit, and believing that the Divine Teacher has been all along, by secret ways of His Wisdom, leading on the human race into the clearer light,—into the further knowledge of Himself, and of their relations to Him,—we receive the Hebrew Scriptures as a gracious gift of God, which He in His Providence has 'caused to be written for our learning' in Divine things. And the Hebrew race, it may be—with all their noble qualities, their patient endurance under injuries, too often practised upon them by Christian men in the Name of God, their calm, unshaken, trust in God's faithfulness, their steadfast continuance in well-doing, according to that Law which they believe to be Divine,—may have yet a great part to act, and a great work to do, in the regeneration of mankind. It may be that they, too, shall shake off the superstitious belief of ages, and, reverencing their Scriptures for the living truths which they declared to their forefathers, while other nations lay yet wrapt in the darkness of heathenism, shall yield to the demands of modern science, and give up the story of the Pentateuch as a record of historical fact. Then, also, may Missionaries of their race, as well as ours, go forth, far and wide, as heralds of salvation, ministering the 'glad tidings of great joy for all people,' proclaiming with free utterance the Name of the Living God, whom their fathers of old knew and worshipped, telling the nations of His Grace, His Truth, His Righteousness.

APPENDIX TO PART II.

It is possible—if not, indeed, highly probable—that the mysterious Hebrew name for the Deity, which in English we pronounce ‘Jehovah,’ is derived from a Phœnician source. The true pronunciation of this name has long been lost,—the vowel-sounds of ‘Jehovah’ being merely those of the word, which the Jews read instead of the sacred name. But it occurs also as JAH, JAHU, or JEHO; and DIOD. SIC. says, ii.333, —

It is said that among the Arimaspians Zathraustes professed that the good divinity had given him his laws . . . and that among the Jews Moses made a similar claim with respect to the Deity surnamed JAO.

So CLEM. ALEX. says, *Strom.v.p.562*—

He is called JAOU, which is interpreted to mean ‘Who is and who shall be.’

Now the ancient Phœnician language was almost identical with the Hebrew, as is very plainly shown by the series of Phœnician inscriptions, recently published from the British Museum. And this fact, indeed, may be regarded as one which is now admitted by all competent scholars. But, this being the case, it appears further that among the Phœnicians JAO was the Greek expression for the mysterious name of their great Deity, the Sun, regarded as the Source of all Light and Life. He was often called *Baal*, i.e. ‘Master,’ and *Adon* or *Adonis*, i.e. ‘Lord,’ (comp. the Heb. *Adonai* (326)); but the greatest name of all, that which conveyed the highest idea of his grandeur and dignity as the Supreme Deity, was that represented in Greek by JAO. Thus a famous oracle, quoted by MACROBIUS, *Sat.i.18*, says—

It was right that the initiated should hide the blessed mysteries; for in a little deceit there is prudence and an adroit mind. Explain that JAO is the Highest God of all.

The other evidences of the existence of this mysterious name are given at length by Dr. MOVERS, in his *Phœnicia*, i.p.539–558; and he sums up the result of his investigation as follows:—

JAO is the Sun-God at the different times of the year, with the predominant idea of Adonis, as the Harvest-Deity. In general,

however, he represents a complex host of nature-deities, whose powers he comprehends in the meaning of his name, which was one full of mystery, and, according to Sanchoniathon, was taught in the priestly mysteries by the oldest Phœnician hierophants.

Dr. MOVERS does not himself derive the Hebrew name from the Phœnician. He thinks that the latter must have been originally sounded *Jakhveh* = ‘He makes to live’: whereas the former he supposes, in common with most modern critics, to have been sounded *Jahveh* = either ‘He makes to be,’ or ‘He is.’ But, whatever may have been the form and meaning of the Phœnician name, it is plain that it must have been very similar to the Hebrew, which is expressed by the very same letters in Greek, JAO. And, accordingly, we find Phœnician proper names compounded with *Jah*, just as in Hebrew, e.g. *Abdaïos*, JOSEPH. c. Ap. I.18, the name of a Tyrian Suffete (or public officer), which in Hebrew would be identical with *Obadiah*, = ‘Servant of Jah,’ and *Bithias*, Virg. I.738, = *Bithiah*, 1Ch. iv.18,—both of which names appear also in Hebrew, with ‘El’ instead of ‘Jah,’ in the forms Abdiel, Bethuel.

It seems, then, highly probable that the Hebrews, soon after their entrance into Palestine, may have adopted this name, which must have come to their ears,—just as they notoriously adopted the worship, and, no doubt, the names, of so many of the ‘lords many and gods many’ of the tribes of Canaan; comp. Gideon’s surname, *Jerubbaal*, = ‘Baal contends,’ Ju. vi.32, &c.; David’s Son, *Baalyadah*, = ‘Baal knows,’ 1Ch. xiv.7, for which we have *Elyadah*, 2S. v.16, &c. And the common people, we must believe, worshipped JAO much after the same fashion as the people of the country worshipped, with bloody and impure rites. Thus even Jephthah could offer his only daughter as a burnt-offering to Jehovah, Ju. xi.31,39; and men and women might even think of bringing the rewards of whoredom and sodomy ‘into the house of Jehovah,’ in fulfilment of a ‘vow,’ D. xxiii.18.

Some of higher mind, however,—such as Samuel and his school of prophets,—divinely taught to look ‘above nature unto nature’s God,’ may have desired to lift up this name, so august and full of meaning, from the base usage to which they saw it exposed, in the worship of the tribes of Canaan and their own idolatrous fellow-countrymen, and to consecrate it to a higher purpose, as well fitted to express the Self-existent, Eternal, Life-giving, Being, *He Is* or *He makes to be*, and to be henceforward the name of the Living God of Israel. With this view the Elohist document may have been composed, in whatever age it was written. For the Elohist, who omits the name Jehovah in his story, as not known to the patriarchs, until he comes to record the revelation of that name to Moses, must have had, obviously, *some* special object in view in so doing. And, since the narrative of the Burning Bush and the revelation to Moses must be regarded as unhistorical, there seems every reason to believe that it was written by one, who desired to invest this name,—not known to the forefathers of the nation, but acquired by them since they came out of Egypt,—with a high and holy character, and a special solemnity.

In this way, also, may be explained, perhaps, the singular fact, that, whereas so many other names of heathen gods are mentioned, as worshipped by the tribes around and by the Israelites copying their example—Moloch and Astarte, Baal and Ashera, Chemosh and Rimmon, &c.,—yet no name like to JAO is ever mentioned, as the greatest name of the chief Phœnician Deity, though the sacred writers must have known of its existence. It would almost seem as if they shrank from mixing up with dead idols, the ‘abominations’ of the heathen, a name which had now been set apart and sanctified, in the minds of all pious Israelites. The people still, no doubt, for ages—even down to the time of the Captivity—profaned the name, just as the people of the land did, in their common speech, and by the licentious and cruel practices of their worship. Nay, even for eighteen years of Josiah’s reign, there were vessels in

the temple at Jerusalem made for Baal (=the Sun, Adonis), 2K.xxiii.4; there was an Ashera (E.V. ‘grove,’ but really an obscene symbol) in the ‘House of Jehovah,’ v.6, and ‘houses of sodomites’ by the ‘House of Jehovah,’ v.7, &c. And during all this time those great prophets of Judah and Israel, who had been taught from above to glimpse at the great truth, that—

‘God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth’—

had been striving with their perverse and stolid fellow-countrymen, seeking to raise their minds to higher views of the Divine nature, and to teach them to invest that Name, which they were daily using as a common thing, with a high spiritual meaning.

Just so in Zululand we are now teaching the natives to invest their own name for the Supreme Being, *Unkulunkulu*, = ‘The Great-Great-One,’ with a higher, more spiritual meaning than they would otherwise ascribe to it. Yet many years—perhaps, centuries—may pass before the Zulus generally will separate the name from all the absurd notions and legendary stories, which they may now in their wild heathen state connect with it. We must long expect to find that, while those of higher mind, or more favoured with opportunities of learning, will embrace that Name, in all the high significance which Missionaries attach to it, as the Name of their Great Creator, Father, and Friend, ‘in Whom they live, and move, and have their being,’ yet the great mass of the people will continue to use it ignorantly and irreverently, even as now. Just so, too, in Northern Europe, for many centuries after Christianity had been preached among the Scandinavian tribes, the orgies of the Feast of Yule must have often contrasted painfully, side by side with the joys of the Christmas Festival; or, at least, if the latter was observed in towns, where the clergy were at hand to stimulate and guide the devotions of the people, yet in the country districts the Name of Christ must have been long profaned, and the new religion desecrated, by admixture with heathen rites and most incongruous ceremonies.

THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'
Quarterly Review on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 309.

PART III.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1865.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOOD & CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	165
THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY	185
I. THE DEUTERONOMIST DISTINCT FROM THE OTHER WRITERS OF THE	
PENTATEUCH	185
II. CHARACTERISTIC EXPRESSIONS OF THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY .	189
III. FIRST APPROXIMATION TO THE AGE OF THE DEUTERONOMIST .	192
IV. THE BOOK OF THE LAW FOUND IN THE TEMPLE	194
V. THE BOOK FOUND IN JOSIAH'S REIGN, THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY	196
VI. DEUTERONOMY PROBABLY WRITTEN ABOUT THE TIME OF JOSIAH	200
VII. DEUT.I.1—II.37.	202
VIII. DEUT.III.1—IX.29	206
IX. DEUT.X.1—XI.32	210
X. DEUT.XII.1—XIII.18	213
XI. DEUT.XIV.1—29	219
XII. DEUT.XV.1—XVI.22	225
XIII. DEUT.XVII.1-20	228
XIV. DEUT.XVIII.1-22	231
XV. DEUT.XIX.1—XXII.30	233
XVI. DEUT.XXIII.1—XXVI.19	237
XVII. DEUT.XXVII.1-26	240
XVIII. DEUT.XXVIII.1—XXXI.30	243
XIX. THE SONG OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXII.	247
XX. THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXIII.1-7.	248
XXI. THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXIII.8-12	252
XXII. THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXIII.13-29	257
XXIII. DEUT.XXXIV.1-12	262
XXIV. RESULTS OF THE EXAMINATION OF DEUTERONOMY	264
XXV. CONCLUDING REMARKS	267

HÆ sunt religiones, quas sibi a majoribus suis traditas pertinacissimè tueri ac defendere perseverant nec considerant quales sint, sed ex hoc probatas atque veras esse confidunt, quod eas veteres tradiderunt. Tantaque est auctoritas vetustatis, ut inquirere in eam scelus ducatur.—LACTANTIUS, *Inst.* ii. 6.

These are religious beliefs, which, having been handed down to them traditionally by their ancestors, they persist in maintaining, ay, and defending, most pertinaciously; nor do they consider of what sort they are, but hold confidently that they are tried and true, simply for the reason that their elders have transmitted them. And so great is the authority of antiquity that to enquire into it is deemed a crime.

PREFACE TO PART III.

IN this Third Part of my work the course of my argument leads me to consider the Book of Deuteronomy. I have here, as I believe, brought out into view distinctly the following facts.

(1) There are plain signs that Deuteronomy was not written by the same author or authors, by whom the main portion of the rest of the Pentateuch was composed.

(i) There is a marked difference in style and tone between the language of Deuteronomy and that of the other four books of the Pentateuch ;

(ii) There are various expressions, which are habitually used in the other four books, which are never once used by the Deuteronomist ;

(iii) *There are more than thirty others, which were evidently familiar to the Deuteronomist, as he uses each of them on the average eight times in the course of the book, not one of which is used even once in the other four books ;*

(iv) It cannot be believed that Moses, in the short interval of a few weeks at most, between the last act recorded in Numbers and the first in Deuteronomy, should have so completely changed—not only his style and tone, but—his very forms of expression, as these facts would imply, if he had written the whole Pentateuch ;

(v) Hence the above facts prove that, whatever portion of the other four books may be ascribed to Moses, he cannot have composed the book of Deuteronomy ;

(vi) And, of course, the same holds good of any other writer or writers, who may have composed the main portion of those books.

(2) There are plain signs also that the writer of Deuteronomy very probably lived about the age of Josiah and Jeremiah.

(i) There are some expressions in Deuteronomy, which are only found in Jeremiah and the latest writings of the Bible ;

(ii) Almost all the peculiar words and phrases of the Deuteronomist are found also in Jeremiah ;

(iii) The history, as recorded in the Second Book of Kings, makes it highly probable that the book of Deuteronomy was first brought to light in the reign of Josiah.

(3) A close examination of the contents of the book itself confirms very strongly the above conclusions.

(i) There are distinct references to the other books of the Pentateuch as already existing ;

(ii) There are numerous and palpable contradictions to the data of those books, such as would be likely to be introduced by one writing in later days from a very different point of view ;

(iii) In particular, there are remarkable modifications of some of the older laws, which cannot be conceived to have been made by *Moses*, addressing the people only a few months after those same older laws were promulgated (as is supposed) by *Jehovah Himself* ;

(iv) These modifications correspond to the altered circumstances of much later times than those, in which the earlier portions of the Pentateuch (as we believe) were written ;

(v) There are distinct 'signs of time,' which fix the composition of the book in an age subsequent to the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, in the days of Hezekiah ;

(vi) There are special reasons for believing that it was not composed till the *early part of Josiah's reign*, at which time *Jeremiah* lived, and had been already called to the Prophetic office.

It will be seen, throughout the whole of our enquiry, that the evidence is constantly *pointing* towards *Jeremiah*, as, *possibly*, the writer of *Deuteronomy*. For my present purpose it is sufficient if it appears that *Deuteronomy* was very probably written by some great Prophet, in the latter times of the Jewish monarchy, *about* the early part of *Josiah's reign*,—a *general* conclusion, in which the greatest critics are almost *unanimously* agreed, however they may differ in fixing the exact date of its composition. If the above point is substantiated, the main object of my work is gained. The *details* of my criticisms may be confirmed or rejected on further examination: but the traditionary view, which regards the whole *Pentateuch* as written by *Moses*, will appear untenable.

If, therefore, this point be established, it will be unnecessary for me to discuss at length the numerous 'Replies' which have appeared in answer to Part I of my work. There are some, which, from their general fairness and their tone of courtesy and Christian feeling, demand, and have received, my respectful attention. It is obvious, however, that, *if* the arguments produced in this Part shall appear to be valid, the objections to my reasonings in Part I may, for the most part, be dismissed at once, as merely ingenious attempts,—like the 'cycles' and 'epicycles' of the old Ptolemaic system of Astronomy,—to build up a theory, which has no real foundation in fact, and which falls at last by the weight of its own cumbrous additions. In short, it will then be plain that the contradictions, which I have noticed, are *real* contradictions, such as might *à priori* be expected to appear in a composite work like this; and the cause of religious truth will be relieved from the necessity of inventing a variety of processes of 'reconciliation,' often in direct contradiction with one another, which scarcely, I imagine, satisfy altogether the mind of the 'reconciler,' and still less that of the general reader.

And this is, in effect, the conclusion of no less an authority than DEAN MILMAN, who says, in his recently published work, *Hist. of the Jews*, Pref.p.xxxii, that 'all further enquiry has confirmed him in the view,' which he announced 'above thirty years ago,' viz.—

Maintain the numbers [of the story of the Exodus] as they stand, I see no way, without one vast continuous miracle, out of the difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities. Reduce them, and all becomes credible, consistent, and harmonious.

A *reduction* of the numbers will make, no doubt, an Exodus possible and, as I have said elsewhere, perfectly conceivable. But, as is shown in (189–197), no reduction will make the story of the Exodus, as recorded in the *Pentateuch*, consistent and possible. One set of difficulties may be got rid of in this way, but only to introduce another equally formidable.

But, if it be really true, as the Bishop of OXFORD has said, 'that 'much harm has been done among the young by my book,' and that 'it is doing an amount of evil which it is difficult to estimate,'—and if it be also true, as the same Prelate has written, that my arguments are 'but the repetition of old and often-answered cavils,'—it would surely be most desirable,—rather, I should say, it would be felt to be imperatively necessary,—for the Bishops, who condemn me, to put forth a 'Reply,' such as to themselves appeared to be sufficient and satisfactory,—such as might be guaranteed in their name by the authority of the Primate. If this were done, I should be bound by the sense of honour, as well as compelled by the love of truth, to consider seriously the arguments adduced in such a document. I should justly be condemned and disgraced, in the presence of my fellow-countrymen, if I did not do this, and either admit that I am wrong, or point out the defective reasonings of the 'Reply.'

Scarcely any 'Reply' has been made, as yet, to the more important critical arguments adduced in the latter portion of my Second Part. Bishop OLLIVANT has, indeed, addressed to his clergy a 'Second Letter' with reference to it. But, though formerly a Professor of Hebrew literature,—and, as I believe, at this moment the only English Bishop, who has distinguished himself in such studies,—he distinctly says, *p.26*,—

The task of examining *seriatim* the Bishop's minute criticisms I must leave to others.

On one point, however, of these 'minute criticisms' Bishop OLLIVANT does furnish a reply, and the reader will find it quoted in (515), and will be able to judge for himself how far it is satisfactory.

The Rev. W. H. HOARE has also undertaken to make a reply to my reasonings in Part II. But he, too, says, *p.127*,—

The only omission of which I shall be conscious is, the not having gone into the critical history [? 'discussion'] of the Psalms, the Book of Judges, and the Books of Samuel. As it would not help my argument to have done so, and as these are points which turn purely on criticism, I must leave them to others.

I need hardly say that the critical discussion of the Psalms,* &c., which fills the latter half of my Second Part, is that portion of my book, as far as it has yet been published, which appears to

* Since the above was written, Prof. (now Bishop) BROWNE'S 'Five Lectures' have appeared, upon 'The Pentateuch and the Elohistic Psalms.' I find nothing in these 'Lectures' requiring me to modify any of my previous conclusions. Prof. BROWNE'S treatment of the Psalms is too general and superficial to meet the requirements of the case. He asserts, on general grounds, that certain Psalms are David's; but he does not go through a searching, minute examination of them, so as to *prove* that they are, most probably, David's Psalms, or Psalms of the Davidic age. And, until he does this, his arguments can have no weight against the conclusions to be drawn from such Psalms as Ps.lx and Ps.lxviii, which I have *proved*, as I believe,—the last and most important, at all events,—to be, in all probability, David's. But this question of the Psalms is only of secondary importance; and if my arguments derived from them were disproved and set aside altogether, the main results of my criticisms, as to the Mosaic Origin and Historical Credibility of the Pentateuch, would not be at all affected.

me of most importance, and with respect to which I have said in my Preface to Part II, *p.*79, and now repeat, with express reference also to the matter here laid before the reader in Part III,—

It was, perhaps, my knowledge of the overwhelming amount and weight of this evidence, and of much more of the same kind to be produced hereafter, which led me to express myself in the First Part with an assured confidence in the certainty of my conclusions, which some of my Reviewers have condemned, as scarcely warranted in their opinion, by the premisses, even if they were admitted to be true.

Up to the present time none of my Episcopal Brethren, who have condemned me, except Bishop OLIVANT, have taken any notice of these criticisms, except that some have pronounced them, generally, as being ‘rash and feeble,’ ‘unfounded, false, and childish.’*

I said, however, in my last preface, *p.*81 :—

I am naturally anxious to see what the Bishops and Doctors of the Church of England will say upon the subject of my book, and how they will act in the present emergency.

Since then I have been answered, and, I confess, in a way which has disappointed my expectations. For opposition and censure I had prepared myself,—for being misjudged even by many good men, whom I esteem, and for being misrepresented by others, who care only for the triumph of a popular opinion, and not for the truth. I knew from the first that these were the only conditions, on which such a work as this could be conducted, coming, as it does, in direct antagonism with many strong and dear prepossessions, and not a few deep-rooted prejudices. But I had confidence in the power of Truth that it would in the end prevail; and that confidence has been sufficiently justified. To the many correspondents, lay and clerical, who from all parts of the country have written to cheer me with their sympathy, and strengthen me in the resolve to carry on and, if God will, complete my labour, I would here express my heartfelt thanks. It is a source of great comfort to know that so many earnest and devout minds are watching with deep interest the conflict, and rejoicing in the progress and triumph of the Truth. Great service also has been rendered to the cause of ‘free enquiry’ by that portion of the Public Press, which, often without expressing agreement with my views, has yet insisted on a *fair field* being allowed for the discussion of these important questions, and for *time* being given to test the truth of my arguments.

But I have, I confess, been disappointed in the course which has been adopted by the great body of my Episcopal Brethren. I had no reason to suppose that I should receive from *all* of them expressions of sympathy, or encouraging help in my work; from

* In the single short letter of one of my Episcopal Brethren, forbidding his clergy to allow me to minister in his diocese, the following expressions appear, applied either to myself or my work :—‘unfounded,’ ‘false,’ ‘childish,’ ‘heretical,’ ‘blasphemous,’ ‘abominable,’ ‘unhappy,’ ‘blind,’ ‘daring,’ ‘ignorant self-sufficiency,’ ‘instrument of Satan,’ ‘poor Bishop COLENSO.’

some I could only expect condemnation; and, while dissenting from their judgment, I should yet have respected the religious feelings, however (as it seemed to me) mistaken, which to their own minds justified their censures. But I did not imagine that so many of the Bishops of England, with the Bishop of OXFORD at their head, would have absolutely ignored the existence of such a science as Biblical criticism, and its undoubted and undeniable results, in its application to the earlier Hebrew Scriptures. I believed that there were men of science and scholars among them, who, being acquainted generally with these results, would be aware of their reality and importance, and who would feel it to be impossible, in this age of enquiry, any longer to bar out their admission, as facts to be taken account of, like any other facts of science, by the more intelligent minds of the Church of England. I had hoped that their influence would have prevailed to check the hasty judgment of others, less informed than themselves on these matters; and that, if my Episcopal Brethren, generally, did not think it expedient to hold out to me a brotherly right hand of fellowship,—if they condemned me as going too far in my conclusions, or as reasoning too confidently on insufficient premisses,—they would, at least, have recognised that my arguments were not altogether without some real foundation, and ought to be judged upon their merits,—ought to be considered, and, if need be, checked and corrected, not merely thrown aside with contemptuous language, as unfounded and ridiculous. I could not have believed, for instance, that the Bishop of OXFORD would have ventured to say that my ‘speculations, so rash and feeble in themselves,’ are—

‘in all essential points but the repetition of old and often-answered cavils against the Word of God;’—

and still less that His Grace, the Primate of all England, would have pronounced with the high authority of his office, that my objections ‘are for the most part puerile and trite,’—

‘so puerile, that an intelligent youth, who read his Bible with care, could draw the fitting answers from the Bible itself,—so trite, that they have been again and again refuted, two hundred years ago, by Archbishop USHER, one of the most learned annalists of this or of any country, more recently by Bishop WATSON and others.’

It is hardly necessary for me to repeat what the Public Press has already said in reply to such assertions as the above, *viz.* that many of the criticisms in these volumes have *never* been answered, and that the writings of Archbishop USHER and Bishop WATSON will throw no light whatever upon the most important questions which are here discussed. As well might we refer to books of the last century for a refutation of the objections, which are raised to the historical truth of some portions of the book of Genesis, by recent discoveries in geological science. But, on behalf of those, who regard the Bible with a true reverence, as a Divinely-given Teacher, which God in His Providence has ‘caused to be written

for our learning,' but which He wills us to read with intelligent discrimination of its contents, not with a blind unreasoning idolatry of the mere letter, I respectfully protest against the language which the Archbishop of CANTERBURY has, apparently, applied to all those who read my books with interest, by summing them up under three categories, as either 'ignorant,' or 'half-informed,' or else 'rejoicing in anything which can free them from the troublesome restraints of religion.' The object of my whole work is to bind the consciences of men more imperatively than ever by the law of true Religion, which is the law of life and happiness. But, inasmuch as multitudes have already broken loose from the restraints of that traditional religious teaching, which they know to be contradicted by some of the most familiar results of modern Science, now made the common heritage of every educated English child, I believe that I have only done my duty, as a Minister of the National Church, in endeavouring to reestablish a permanent union between the teachings of Religion and Science, and to heal effectively that breach between them, which otherwise will assuredly widen day by day, with infinite injury to the Church itself, and to the whole community.

And here I think it desirable to correct three mistakes, which (as I gather from the letters addressed to their Clergy by several of the Bishops) have been entertained by many with respect to my work.

(i) It has been stated that I *deny the Inspiration of the Bible*.

I reply that I have nowhere denied it, nor have even considered at all the question of Scripture Inspiration. I have left that subject wholly untouched: it is no part of my present plan to discuss it. Doubtless, the plain results of criticism, such as those set forth in these volumes, must indirectly affect the views which may be taken of Inspiration, and must certainly, if seen to be true results, conflict entirely with the traditional view of the Divine *Infallibility* of Scripture. But it is no part of my present *object* to prove even this. I have only had in view 'to examine critically the Pentateuch and book of Joshua,' with the special purpose of determining, as far as possible, the age and authorship of the different books.

(ii) Again, it has been said that I *wish to prove the Pentateuch—and in fact, the whole Bible—to be untrue*.

Nothing can be further from my wish or purpose than this. Rather, I desire to know what *is* true in the Pentateuch history, and in the Bible generally. I wish to know, if possible, in what age, by what persons, under what circumstances, the different portions of the Bible were written, that I may be able to judge for myself, and help others to judge, as to the amount of credibility to be attached to the different narratives. If I had found reason

to believe that Moses really wrote the account of the Exodus, describing what he had himself personally said, and done, and witnessed, I should have felt bound to believe his statements, as those of a devout, God-fearing, man; and then, whatever miraculous accounts they might have contained, such statements would, assuredly, not have involved the contradictions, which appear upon a close inspection of the present Pentateuch. But the process of critical enquiry, so far from eliciting *proofs* and *confirmations* of the Mosaic origin of these books, leads quite to the opposite conclusion. *All the arguments, drawn from an examination of the Pentateuch, point in one direction.* It is well to observe this. There is literally *nothing* in these books distinctly indicative of Mosaic authorship. The whole force of the argument for that authorship rests upon tradition, and may be referred back to the opinion of the Jews, who lived nearly a thousand years after the date assigned to Moses. It is not a question of *balanced internal evidence*, but a case where there is a *host* of indications, all tending to show diversity of authorship and late date, and *none* discoverable, by all the ingenuity yet brought to bear upon the subject, which tends decidedly the other way; and the supporters of the traditional view will be found to be constantly occupied,—not in producing ‘internal evidence’ to show that Moses *did* write the Pentateuch, but—in trying to account for the existence, on the assumption of his authorship, of so much internal evidence of the contrary. In short, the strength of the resistance to the critical conclusion lies in the feeling, that we do not *like* to think that those books could have grown up in the way, which the ‘internal evidence’ clearly indicates,—the way in which, be it observed, the religious books of all other nations are known to have been formed.

(iii) Further, it has been stated, by more than one of my Episcopal Brethren, that I have charged the Clergy generally with *dishonesty*, in concealing their views about the Deluge, and using the Baptismal Form of Prayer without believing in it. I reply that I have never charged any with ‘dishonesty’ in this respect; and, if I thought that my words justly allowed of such a construction being placed on them, I should express my regret that I have made use of language that was capable of being so misconstrued. Nor did I *volunteer* to make any reference at all in this matter to the Clergy. In what I said, I acted strictly in self-defence. I was accused of being ‘dishonest’ myself, in retaining my clerical office, while disbelieving many or most of the details of the story of the Exodus,—*directly*, by many of the Clergy, and *indirectly* by one, for whose high character, as a lover of truth and fair-dealing, and for whose conduct under present circumstances, I have the most profound esteem. The Bishop of LONDON had stated, in his Charge to his Clergy, that our National Church was based

upon the principle of 'free enquiry,'—that to enquire was the *right* of an English Clergyman in all cases, and frequently his *duty*,—but that,—

'if such enquiry led to *doubt*, and if the doubt ended in disbelief of the Church's doctrines, of course he would resign his office as one of the Church's authorised teachers.'

I might have replied to such an observation that WYCLIF did not retire from his sacred office, though disbelieving the doctrines, which he himself believed when he entered the Ministry, and which were taught by the clergy generally in his day, and that CRANMER, RIDLEY, and LATIMER, and other Bishops, though consecrated as Bishops of the Roman Church, and bound by the solemn vows of their ordination in that Church, did not *resign* their sees as soon as they became *Protestant* Bishops, and the National Church by the National Will had become Protestant also, nor afterwards, when by the same Will the Church ceased to be Protestant, and once more became Romanised.

But I felt that, in the present instance, there was far less reason for urging upon me such a course as a plain duty, inasmuch as very many of the Clergy, I believed, and certainly not a few of my Episcopal Brethren, did *not* accept the story of the Noachian Deluge as literally and historically true, and yet justified themselves in retaining their offices in the Church. If my conduct was 'dishonest,' so, too, was theirs; for my 'dishonesty,' surely, could not consist in openly professing that which others secretly held. If *they* were 'honest' in the course which they were pursuing—and I expressed no doubt whatever of this—I felt that it was unfair and ungenerous to charge upon me, as a crime, the very same proceeding as their own—the same exactly in principle, though differing, it may be, in degree. I admit fully that any of the Clergy who *do* 'unfeignedly believe'—as some, I presume, do—in the literal historical truth of the story of the Flood as told in G.vi,vii,viii, have a right to bring the charge against me of not believing what they deem essential to a true faith in the authority of the Bible. And, if there are *not*, as I said in my former Preface, 'multitudes of the more intelligent Clergy,' who, on geological or other grounds, have come to disbelieve in that narrative as a true piece of history, then I am wrong in my assumption, and owe my Clerical Brethren an apology for ascribing such disbelief to them.

But as to those, be they many or few in number, who do not believe in the literal truth of the Noachian Deluge, I did not impute to them 'dishonesty' in holding those opinions, and yet retaining their clerical office. On the contrary, I assigned certain reasons, which, I thought, would satisfy different classes of minds, and enable them still with a clear conscience to use the Form of Prayer which referred to that narrative. Being persuaded, how-

ever, that in this age of advancing Science such Clergymen *are* many, and believing also that the Laity have rarely heard from the pulpit any reference to the account of Noah's Flood, as being otherwise than literally and historically true, I am obliged to conclude that, by some cause or other, such Clergymen *have* been prevented from speaking to their people the plain truth upon this point. And I believe that they have been impeded by the restraints, real or supposed, of those stringent obligations, which the Church of England at the present time enforces on her Clergy at Ordination.

Here, also, I desire to say a few words more plainly in explanation of my present position, with reference to the assumptions made by some of my Episcopal Brethren, in their recent letters of inhibition. His Grace the Archbishop of CANTERBURY, in a letter dated March 31, addressed to the Clergy of his Diocese, has stated that I 'have refused to resign the See of Natal, though I cannot deny that I am unable to exercise the most important functions of that office.'

I presume His Grace to refer, in these words, to the reply which I gave to a letter addressed to me by the great majority of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church of England. In that reply, I did not think it necessary to contradict formally the three assumptions which had been made by my Episcopal Brethren, considering that anyone acquainted with my books would be aware that they were not correct statements of the facts of the case; and feeling also that an answer at full length was the less needed, as the letter of the Bishops appeared in the *Times* almost as soon as it had reached my hands,—before I had had time to reply to it,—from which circumstance I could only infer that it was intended rather for the *public* than for myself, though expressing 'deep brotherly anxiety' for me. As, however, the Archbishop and several of the Bishops have again referred to this subject, I think it due to myself to notice this charge; and I do it also with a view to those of the Clergy and Laity, who agree with me in believing that the right and duty of free enquiry to its fullest extent is the very foundation on which—not true Religion only, but—our Protestant National Church is based, and that an honest and fearless statement of the Truth, as the result of such enquiry, is the only condition of its permanent existence, and the only ground of hope for its continuance, from age to age, in healthy and vigorous action, amidst the rapid advances of modern Science.

The letter of my Episcopal Brethren contained, as I have said, three assumptions, which are expressly or virtually negatived by the plain words of my books.

- (i) 'We understand you to say that you do not now believe that which you

voluntarily professed to believe, as the indispensable condition of your being entrusted with your present office.

Ans. When I was ordained Deacon and Priest, I professed to 'believe unfeignedly all the Canonical Scriptures.' I have said that I *then* understood those words in their most obvious and natural sense,—the sense in which some of the Bishops, and many of the Clergy, at this very time receive them,—as implying that those Scriptures were, in matters of historical fact, as well as in statements of moral and religious truth, divinely and infallibly true. I have said also that I had ceased to believe this, and that I was pained to find my convictions contradicting, as I conceived, the words of the Ordination Service, until it was declared, on the highest legal authority of the Church of England, that my former view—I may say, the popular view—of the meaning of those words was mistaken, and that they must be held to mean no more than a simple expression of a *bond fide* belief that 'the Holy Scriptures contain everything necessary to salvation,' and that 'to that extent they have the direct sanction of the Almighty.' I have stated distinctly, Part I, p.22, and I here repeat, that 'I am not conscious of having said anything which contravenes this decision.

(ii) 'We understand you to say that you have entertained, and have not abandoned, the conviction, that you could not use the Ordination Service, inasmuch as in it you must require from others a solemn declaration that they 'unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament,' which, with the evidence now before you, it is impossible wholly to believe in.'

Ans. I cannot but suppose that His Grace, and others of my Episcopal Brethren who subscribed the above words, could not have been aware that they are directly set aside by my own language in the Preface to Part I, where, after showing that at one time I felt the impossibility of demanding from a candidate for Orders *such* a confession of belief in the Holy Scriptures as I then considered—and as many still consider—to be required by the formula of the Ordination Service, I have added (since reading in England the judgment of Dr. LUSHINGTON) the following note:—

'This was written before the recent decision of the Court of Arches, by which, of course, the above conclusion is *materially affected*.'

It would now be possible for me to require such a declaration from a candidate for Orders, provided that I had first fully explained to him, and to the Congregation, *in what sense the Church intends such a declaration to be made*.

(iii) 'We understand you further to intimate that those who think with you are precluded from using the Baptismal Service, and consequently (as we must infer) other offices of the Prayer Book, unless they omit all such passages as assume the truth of the Mosaic History.'

Ans. This assumption, again, is contradicted by my own language already referred to, in the Preface to Part II, where I have said that many Clergymen, who do not believe in the historical truth of the Noachian Deluge, will yet be able to justify themselves in one of two ways, in using still such a Form of Prayer. If it is perfectly understood that a Minister is at full liberty to explain to his people freely his opinion respecting the Biblical account of the Deluge, the unhistorical character of the Mosaic story, or the age and authorship of Deuteronomy,—(and this appears likewise to be decided in the affirmative by the same legal judgment,)—I apprehend that many, who have an intelligent acquaintance with the results of modern criticism, may still be content to read the allusions in the Liturgy. But I felt also that there might be others, of more scrupulous conscience, who would not be satisfied with this mode of meeting the difficulty, and to whom I could give no other advice than that which I have given, viz. to *omit* such expressions, and take the consequences of such omission.* I consider, however, that such passages ought no longer to be retained, as of absolute obligation, in our Prayer Book; and I hold it to be my duty, as a Bishop of the National Church, to labour for their removal—or, at least, for the liberty being granted of omitting them—as soon as possible.

This, then, is what I meant when I contradicted publicly the assumption of my Episcopal Brethren, that, while holding my present views, I cannot use the language of the Baptismal and Ordination Services. I *can* use that language—provided that I

* I need hardly say that it is satisfactory to me to find that, in giving such advice as the above, I am supported by the practice of His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury, who stated in his place in the House of Lords, on Monday, June 1, 1863, that 'he had been consulted frequently' by clergymen, who had conscientious scruples against using certain words of the Burial Service in particular cases, in which, however, by the law and by their ordination vows they were required to use them,—and he had said this, that *nothing would induce him to pronounce these words' in such cases—'he would stand the risk of all the penalties of the law rather than do so.'*

claim it as my right, as a Minister of the National Church, and lay it upon myself as a duty, to explain freely and fully to my people in what sense I use it. And what are others doing in this respect? How does my conduct differ essentially, in respect of honest adherence to the principles of the Church of England, from theirs? The Bishop of OXFORD was the *first* to issue a letter of inhibition, after my reply to the address of the Archbishops and Bishops. Not, then, in his personal capacity, but as a representative of those, who have followed him in adopting this extraordinary mode of public Church censure,—upon the mere judgment of each individual Bishop, without any hearing or trial of the accused,—I would ask the Bishop of OXFORD before my fellow-countrymen, Does *he*, a Fellow of the Royal and other Scientific Societies, believe unfeignedly in the literal historical truth of the account of the Creation, the Noachian Deluge, or the numbers of the Exodus? If the Bishop will say that he *does* ‘unfeignedly believe’ in all these matters, as related in the Pentateuch, of course, I have nothing more to say as regards this part of my argument. But, if he does not, then how, I repeat, does his present conduct differ essentially from mine? *He* has some way of explaining these matters, which satisfies his own mind, as I have. And the only difference is this, that I think it to be my duty, and shall make it my practice, to tell my people plainly, on such points, what I believe, and what I know to be true; and the Bishop of OXFORD has not yet, as far as I am aware, thought it necessary to say what he really thinks upon any one of these subjects.

In fact, judging from their published documents, it is very difficult to say what many of those, who have so severely condemned me, do really believe themselves with respect to the narratives of the Pentateuch. They have expressed themselves, indeed, in the strongest terms, as resting their hopes of eternity upon the ‘Word of God.’ But *that*, I trust, I do, as truly and entirely as they. There is a sense also in which I am quite ready to speak of the Bible as the ‘Word of God,’—just as we call a Church the ‘House of God,’ without meaning, therefore, to say that the plan or material of the building is Divine, or that God meets with us there exclusively. But I prefer the language of the First Homily, ‘*In it (Holy Scripture) is contained the true Word of God;*’ and I agree fully with the language of Dean MILMAN, who says, *Hist. of the Jews*, Pref.p.xi:—

The moral and religious truth, *and this alone*, I apprehend, is the ‘Word of God’ contained in the Sacred Writings. I know no passage in which this emphatic term is applied to any sentence or saying, which does not convey or enforce such truth.

On this account I am unwilling to make use of the expression ‘The Bible is the Word of God,’—though in the sense of the words above explained I *can* use it,—because it is so likely to mislead the uneducated, and induce them to attach a superstitious

reverence to the mere text of Scripture. But, when my Brethren use the expression 'Word of God,' the question arises, What do *they* mean? Their language at one time seems to imply that they attach a Divine Infallibility to every line and letter of the mere text of the Bible, so that, as the Bishop (LEE) of Manchester said,—

'all our hopes for eternity, the very foundations of our faith, our nearest and dearest consolations, are taken from us, if one line of that Sacred Book be declared to be unfaithful or untrustworthy.'

But, when the writer of the above words is pressed for an answer, as to one particular statement of the Bible being true on a point of natural history, he immediately, while maintaining his position in words, abandons it in point of fact, and retreats behind the assertion that—

'every line of Scripture will amply bear the pressure of any test applied to it, *if viewed with relation to the subject it really refers to, the state, mentally and morally, of those to whom it was addressed, and the effect it was intended to convey*'—

a statement, which, whatever may be its precise meaning, at all events allows of the recognition of the results of my own critical enquiries. The other inhibiting Bishops, as I have said, with the single exception of the Bishop of LLANDAFF, have contented themselves with simply condemning my book.*

But what do my Episcopal Brethren mean by this proceeding? Do they really suppose that, by the obstructions of Church censures and anathemas, or the mere exercise of authority, they can bar out the entrance of that light of Critical Science, which God Himself has given us, as one of the special blessings bestowed upon us by His Goodness in this day? May it not be that the Science of Biblical Criticism is as needful to our true progress and highest happiness as any other of the Sciences—as Geology, Astronomy, Chemistry, Natural History, &c.—all which have been aroused into new life in this very age, and many of which—like that of Biblical Criticism—were almost wholly unknown to our forefathers? May it not be true that each one of these Sciences is as truly intended by the Wisdom and Grace of God for the present stage of human development, as any other of the sisterhood,—that we cannot despise or refuse the help of any one of them, without 'rejecting the counsel of God against ourselves,'—that, 'if this

* The venerable Bishop of EXETER has surprised me, as much as any of my Brethren, by the course which he has taken. In a letter to his Clergy, he has very justly condemned the practice of 'prejudging matters which must be the subject of Judicial consideration before our Archbishop,' and *not* 'adhering' to the very proper 'resolution of a meeting of the Bishops,' viz. 'to avoid any extra-judicial declaration' on this subject. And his language bears with special force upon those who may be called to sit hereafter as judges, but who, by distinct expression of their sentiments beforehand, in public official documents, have surely gone far to 'endanger the impartiality and purity of the tribunal of justice.' In a further address to his Clergy, the Bishop of EXETER is reported to have said that he 'has not read the book which has occasioned so much alarm,' and 'cannot, therefore, speak of its real contents,' and that, 'not having examined the book, he will not condemn it.' Yet he 'is thankful that it has called forth so strong a feeling of indignation against me,' and he, too, 'inhibits me from ministering in his diocese.'

work be of God, we cannot overthrow it, lest haply we be found fighting against God'? In short, may it not be true that this light of Criticism may be but one of the many-coloured rays of modern Science, which come to us all from the 'Father of Lights,' in this our own age of wonderful Illumination, and which are meant to blend together into the pure, white, Light of Truth, that Light which our spirits need, and which His Wisdom and His Love at this time impart to us?

Must we, then, English Christians, live on, as men did in former ages, under strict ecclesiastical restraints, as if there was a 'dark chamber' in the house, into which we have once looked, but have shut to the door, and dare not look again, lest we should see something to frighten us out of our 'hopes for eternity,' and cause us the loss of 'all our nearest and dearest consolations'? How much better to open wide the door, and let in the blessed light and air of day, into every part of our spiritual dwelling! That light, indeed, may show us that the stories of the six days' Creation, the Noachian Deluge, the slaughter of 68,000 Midianitish women and children, are no longer to be spoken of as historical facts. We may perceive that it is no longer possible to confound the early legends of the Hebrew people, and statements contrary to reason and the facts of nature, or condemned by our moral sense, and by the Voice which witnesses for God within us, with the Eternal 'Word of God.' But we shall find in the Pentateuch, notwithstanding, precious things without number, of which little or no use is made at present in the instruction of the people,—unquestionable facts of ancient history, mixed up, no doubt, with much of uncertain or unreal tradition,—and, above all, rich lessons of spiritual Truth, by which our souls may be cheered and strengthened for the work of life. What a day of regenerated life will it be for the Church of England, when these things shall be spoken of, plainly and freely, in every pulpit of the land,—when the Bible shall be opened, and the story of its origin explained, and the real value of its histories discussed, as the records of living men, like ourselves, written down by living men,—with the reverence due to a Book so venerable, and endeared to the inmost heart of every Christian, but yet without fear of treading with irreligious feet upon holy ground,—rather, with the deepest and most sincere conviction that we can only thus serve God acceptably, and discharge our duty before Him, as Christian men and Ministers, by such free enquiry after Truth, and such free utterance of it.

But another cry has been raised against my work, and, indeed, the loudest and most terrible of all, the cry of 'Heresy!' 'Blasphemy!' To my utter amazement, the two Archbishops have swelled this cry,—not to speak of the language used by others of my Episcopal Brethren, as that of the Bishop of CHICHESTER,

already quoted. The Archbishop of CANTERBURY has spoken of my works as 'derogatory to the person, the attributes, and the work, of our Divine Redeemer,' and as 'charging Him, who knew what was in man, with ignorance and imposture.' And, in like manner, the Archbishop of YORK reproaches me with 'having imputed to the Lord of glory ignorance of holy things,' and 'having described our Lord as a blind guide, quoting, for the very Word of Life, the baseless fables of men.'

I say that I have been amazed at such language being used by these eminent Prelates; because I could not have believed that persons so high in office and judicial position would, in statements like these, have branded me publicly, before the whole Church, with charges of 'heresy' and 'blasphemy,' for the expressions which I have used in my books on *this* point. Whatever they might have thought of the soundness of my criticism, or however they might have differed from my views of Inspiration, yet I could not have imagined that they would either have been unaware of the fact, that, in using such expressions with respect to our 'Lord's ignorance as the Son of Man,' I was perfectly justified by the practice of the most eminent theologians, both ancient and modern, or that, being aware of this, they would have allowed me to be covered with reproach and censure on this account,—nay, with their own hands would have flung some of the hardest stones against me. I thought that, of course, the Bishops and Doctors of the Church,—more especially those who, like Archbishop THOMSON and Bishop ELLICOTT, have gained a reputation for theological learning, or who, like Dean ALFORD and Prof. BROWNE, (as will be seen below,) have expressed the very same view in substance as my own,—would protect me, at all events, from such accusations. Otherwise, I should have produced further evidence in my Second Part, to justify my use of the language so much condemned. In support of my position I now produce it, in the contents of the following communication, which has been sent to me by a clergyman, unknown to me personally at present, though well-known as the writer of various zoological papers in scientific journals, and the chief contributor on the Natural History of the Bible to the second volume of Dr. SMITH's *Dictionary*. I will only add that I am deeply sensible of the courage and sincerity which he has shown, amidst the violent excitement of these times, in thus coming forward, unsolicited, to bear this testimony in the service of the Truth.

MY LORD,

If there is one passage in your recently published work on the Pentateuch, which more than another has subjected you to very severe condemnation, it is that which contains the following statement, (Part II, p. xvii):—

'This only I repeat once more. The recognition of the gradual growth of JESUS, as the Son of Man, in human knowledge and science of all kinds, such as that which concerns the question of the age and authorship of the Pentateuch, is perfectly com-

patible with—rather, is absolutely required by—the most orthodox faith in His Divinity, as the Eternal Son of God.’

Very hard words, my Lord, have been uttered against you for maintaining this so-called ‘heretical’ opinion.

The doctrine, which is embodied in the paragraph quoted above from your book, has lately been occupying my close attention; and, as the result of my investigations, I shall show—

(i) That it is expressly taught by our Lord Himself;

(ii) That it has the sanction of very many eminent Biblical writers, both ancient and modern;

(iii) That it is implied in the language of the formularies of our Church.

(i) Speaking of the destruction of Jerusalem or of the end of the World, our Lord says, ‘Of that day and hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, *neither the Son, but the Father*,’ Mark xiii.32.

LEONTIUS *de Sectis*, *act. ult.* writes as follows:—

‘One must know that most of the Fathers—indeed, almost all—appear to say that He (CHRIST) was ignorant of some things; for, if he is said to be in all respects of the same substance with us, and we are ignorant of some things, it is manifest that He also was ignorant, and the Scripture says of Him that He increased in age and wisdom.’

St. AMBROSE, *De Fide*, 5, cap. xviii, §221, though he was somewhat afraid of holding the doctrine himself, yet admits that it was held by many, when he says:—

‘There are many, however, not quite so timid as I am,—for I had rather fear deep things, than be wise about them,—there are many, I say, relying on what is written, ‘And Jesus progressed in wisdom, &c.’ who say confidently that, according to His Divine Nature, indeed, He could not have been ignorant of those things which are future, but that, according to His assumption of our condition, He said before His crucifixion, that He was ignorant as the Son of Man. . . . He seems, therefore, to be ignorant in the same nature in which He progresses.’

GREGORY NAZ. *Or. xxxvi* (xxx).15, writes:—

‘To whom can it be a matter of doubt that He has a knowledge of that hour, indeed, as God, but is ignorant of it, as Man? . . . For, inasmuch as the name ‘Son’ is used in this passage absolutely, and without being referred to any one, and it is not added, *whose Son*, on that account a handle is hence afforded to us of so considering the matter as to interpret this ignorance in the most pious sense, ascribing it to His Humanity, not to His Divinity.

THEODORET *ad IV Cyr. Anathem.* says:—

‘The ignorance, then, does not belong to God the Word, but to the form of the servant, which knew at that time such things as the indwelling Divinity revealed.’

ATHANASIUS, *Disc. II against Arianism*, (PUSEY’S translation, *Library of the Fathers*), ch. xxviii, writes as follows:—

‘Why, though He knew, He said ‘no, not the Son knows,’ this, I think, none of the faithful is ignorant, *viz.* that He made this, as those other declarations, *as Man*, by reason of the flesh. For this, as before, is not the Word’s deficiency, but of that human nature, whose property it is to be ignorant. . . Not then, when the heaven was made by Him, nor when He was with the Father Himself, the Word ‘disposing all things,’ nor before He became Man, did He say it, but when ‘the Word became flesh.’ On this account it is reasonable to ascribe to His Manhood everything which, after He became Man, He speaks humanly. . . .

‘Certainly, when He says in the Gospel, concerning Himself, in His human character, ‘Father, the hour is come, glorify Thy Son,’ it is plain that He knows also the hour of the end of all things as the Word, though, *as Man*, He is ignorant of it, for ignorance is proper to man, and especially ignorance of these things. Moreover, this is proper to the Saviour’s love of man; for, since He was made man, he is not ashamed because of the flesh which is ignorant, to say, ‘I know not,’ that He may show that, knowing as God, He is but ignorant according to the flesh. And, therefore, He said not, ‘no, not the Son of God knows,’ lest the Godhead should seem ignorant, but simply, ‘no, not the Son,’ that the ignorance might be *the Son’s as born among men*. . . .

‘For, as on becoming man He hungers and thirsts and suffers with men, so with men, *as Man*, He knows not.’

Upon the above Dr. PUSEY notes as follows, after stating what he considers to be the ‘doctrine of the Church’ on this point:—

‘However, this view of the sacred subject was received by the Church after St. ATHANASIUS’S day; and it cannot be denied that he and others of the most eminent Fathers use language, which *primâ facie* is inconsistent with it. They certainly seem to impute ignorance to our Lord as Man, as ATHANASIUS in this passage.’

And Dr. PUSEY quotes St. CYRIL, *Trin. pp.* 623–4, ‘Why blush they at the conditions of the manhood, and determine to find fault with what especially befits the economy of the flesh?’ and he says, ‘THEODORET expresses the same opinion very strongly.’ He adds also in a note on p. 464, It is a *question to be decided*, whether our Lord . . . spoke of a *real* ignorance, or of an ‘economical’ or *professed* ignorance.’ He pro-

duces several of the Fathers in support of this latter view. But he quotes also THEOPHRET as 'very severe on the principle of 'economy':—'If He knew the day, and, wishing to conceal it, said He was ignorant, see what a *blasphemy* is the result! Truth tells an untruth!'

CYRIL of Alexandria, Ed. *Migne*, Tom. 75, p. 367, says:—

'We ought not, on account of this expression, to accuse the *Word of God*, and rashly to impute any ignorance to Him. But we should rather admire His love towards man, who did not refuse, out of His love towards us, to bring Himself down to so great humiliation, as to bear all things that are ours, one of which also is *ignorance*.'

And again CYRIL says, *Theo.* p. 221:—

'Just as Christ took this upon Himself in common with men, to hunger, thirst, and suffer the other things which are spoken about Him, exactly in the same way *there is nothing to offend any one, if He be said, as Man, to have been ignorant also in common with men*.'

CHRYSOSTOM, *Hom.* cxvii, says:—

'He is ignorant then, according to His human nature, who knows all things according to the power of His Divinity.'

AUGUSTINE himself, however, and the Theologians of his day, interpret the expression, 'neither the Son,' to denote, not that Christ, even as Man, was actually ignorant of the day of judgment, but that he was unwilling to communicate it, an explanation plainly untenable, as Archbishop TILLOTSON has shown in his Sermon cxxix, on the text in question, from which I extract the following:—

'Some, and those of no small account, have understood these words, as if our Saviour only intended to put off His disciples from a more particular enquiry about the matter; not that He was ignorant of the day of judgment, but that He did not know it, so as to reveal it to them,—which is by no means to be admitted: not only because it looks too like the equivocation of the Jesuits, but likewise because the same may be said of the *angels*, since it is not otherwise denied of the angels, that they know this time, than it is of the Son. Others say that His human nature was not ignorant of the day of judgment, but that it did not know this of itself, but by virtue of its union with the Divine nature. But our Saviour absolutely says that the Son did not know it. And, therefore, others more reasonably have distinguished between His human nature and His Divine; and, though as God He could not be ignorant of anything, yet *His human understanding did not know it*.'

... If this be not admitted, how can we understand that passage concerning our Saviour, Luke ii. 52, 'that Jesus grew in wisdom, &c.'? ... For, if the human nature of Christ did necessarily know all things by virtue of its union with the Divinity, He could not then, as Man, be said to *grow in wisdom*.'

HAMMOND, on Mark xiii. 32, writes:—

'But for the doctrine of those which ... only affirm that, though as God He knew all, yet as Man He was ignorant of some things, just in the same manner as He was passible and subject to all human infirmities which had not sin in them, and that this is His own express affirmation that *the Son of Man knew not that day and hour*, this sure is so far from heresy that ... it is the [almost] unanimous assertion of all the Fathers, to which neither the Council of Chalcedon nor any other hath taught anything contrary.'

LIGHTFOOT, *Exercit.* on Mark xiii. 32, writes:—

'To say that the Second Person in the Trinity knows not something, is blasphemous; to say so of the *Messias*, is not so, who, nevertheless, was the same with the Second Person in the Trinity.'

CALVIN says on Luke ii. 40:—'Certainly, when the Apostle teaches that (JESUS) was like to us in all things, sin excepted, without doubt he comprehends this also that His soul was subjected to ignorance. ... Although the Person of God and Man was one, yet it does not follow that anything, that was proper to the Divine nature, was given to the human nature. ... In fine, unless anyone pleases to deny that Christ was made a true man, let us not be ashamed also to confess that He voluntarily took upon Himself all things, which cannot be separated from human nature. The objection, however, is foolishly made that ignorance, as being the punishment of sin, does not comport with Christ; for the same would have to be said also with respect to death. ... But, when Luke says that He was strengthened in spirit, and filled with wisdom, he signifies that whatever wisdom belongs to men, and daily accrues to them, flows from that one only fountain, viz. the Spirit of God.'

But I need not multiply quotations. GROTIUS, CLARIUS, J. CAPELLUS, the elder ROSENMÜLLER, D'OYLY and MANT, WHITBY, BENGE, all maintain the doctrine.

Bishop HORNE writes, *Disc.* LV. iii. p. 208:—

'He [the Son] had also a Soul, endued with the same faculties as ours. His understanding was capable of learning and improvement; for, as Man, He was ignorant of some things which He might know, and He 'grew,' it is said, 'in Wisdom as well as Stature.'

WATKLAND, ii. p. 162, (*Oxf. Ed.* 1856,) writes as follows:—

'As it may be truly said of the body of man that it is not immortal, though the soul be, so it may be truly said that the Son of Man was not knowing, though the Son

of God knew everything. . . . He denies the knowledge of the day of judgment, but in respect of His human nature; in which respect also He is said to have 'increased in wisdom,' Luke ii.52, the Divine *Logos* having with the human nature assumed the *ignorance* and other *infirmities* proper to it.'

Prof. HAROLD BROWNE writes, *Art.i.p.96*:—

'That He (Jesus) had a perfect human soul appears from His 'increasing in wisdom,' Luke ii.52, from the possibility of His being ignorant, Mark xiii.32, which could not be true of Him considered only in his Divine nature.'

(iii) Lastly, this doctrine, lately so violently impugned, but so generally acknowledged hitherto, is implied in the language of our Church's formularies. A few words will suffice. The 16th Article teaches that 'Christ in the truth of our nature was made like unto us in all things, sin only except.' In the Athanasian Creed we acknowledge Christ to be 'perfect God and perfect Man.' How can we possibly receive this doctrine with regard to His human nature, if we deny to that nature one of the most essential attributes of humanity?

Thus, my Lord, you have been judged a heretic for promulgating a doctrine, which is expressly taught by our Lord Himself and by the Evangelist St. Luke, which is implied in the formularies of the Church of England, and is sanctioned by many of the most learned and devout writers, both ancient and modern.

And now, my Lord, with respect to the general character of your recent publications on the Pentateuch, I feel it my positive duty, at whatever cost, to say a few plain and honest words. I have diligently, conscientiously, and prayerfully, studied the whole question at issue for the last six months, and am compelled to admit the general truth of your arguments, though differing in some particulars. You are aware that I published a pamphlet in reply to your Part I; I have withdrawn that reply from circulation. Before the appearance of your Book, however, I was quite certain that the *Bible* and *Science* were opposed to each other. Four years' examination of almost every word in the Bible relating to its Natural History has convinced me that, in many essential points, the Biblical and Natural records are, to use the words of the learned and candid KALISCH, 'utterly and irreconcilably at variance.' The more I examine the whole question for myself, the more certain I become that in the Bible 'legend is mixed up with history, poetic imaginings with prosaic narrative, that no miraculous power has been exerted to preserve it from omissions, interpolations, and corruptions of the text,' and that the Bible 'is, therefore, not infallible in the sense in which the popular creed assumes it to be.'

We acknowledge, my Lord, notwithstanding a large admixture of the human, and, therefore, fallible, element in the Bible, that in that Book there is a *jewel* of heavenly lustre and of priceless value. Why are we to suppose that this *jewel* shines less brilliantly, or loses one iota of its value, because the gold of its *setting* has a considerable percentage of alloy? Why will men refuse to drink of the 'water of life,' because it is offered to them in an earthen vessel?

Your Lordship is at liberty to make any use you please of this letter.

I remain, my Lord, your faithful and obedient servant,

PRESTON RECTORY, WELLINGTON, SALOP: May 20, 1863.

W. HOUGHTON.

But, it is said, 'the same spirit of enquiry will be carried into the writings of the New Testament.' I answer, undoubtedly it will, and must be; and, if there is any part of the Church's teaching, depending on the New Testament, which will not bear the test of Truth, we shall, of course, as servants of the God of Truth, be bound to reject that also. Is there, then, a 'dark chamber' here too, which we are afraid to examine,—into which we dare not suffer the light of day to enter? Is this the security on which we hold our 'hopes for eternity,' our 'nearest and dearest consolations,' that we must not venture to apply to the records, on which we build our faith, an honest and searching criticism, such as we should certainly bring to the examination of documents of far less vital consequence? Let not me, or those who think with me, be blamed for this suggestion. It is not mine, and I have no dread of such enquiries; I know that they will only tend still more to advance God's Glory, and our eternal welfare, through the progress of His Truth among men. Let those be blamed who have put forth this argument, for the purpose of

keeping men still bound, hand and foot, in the swaddling-clothes of old traditions, and checking all examination like this into the historical truth of the Pentateuch, instead of recognising at once, in the face of the Church, the results of modern criticism, as established facts, and doing their part to harmonise them with those doctrinal teachings, which they deem to be part of the sum and substance of Christianity. One important difficulty, upon which we have soon stumbled in the very outset of these enquiries, I have done my best to remove; and for so doing I have been reproached as a 'heretic' and 'blasphemer.' But other difficulties will, no doubt, arise, and, indeed, have already been raised, not merely by the progress of criticism, but by recent discoveries in geological and other sciences, which must tend to modify materially some of those traditional views, which have been hitherto maintained on the assumption of the historical truth of the early portions of the Pentateuch. I believe that I am doing the best service to the cause of true Religion by showing that we are not obliged to receive as the Infallible 'Word of God' these statements, which conflict with the certain conclusions of Science, and by asserting that the 'Word of God' is wholly independent of the amount of credence which we give to these ancient narratives. Very striking and important are these words of Dean MILMAN, *Latin Christianity*, vi.p.633, quoted by me in Part I, but little noticed by those, who have inveighed so severely against me:—

As it is my own confident belief that the words of Christ, and His words alone, (the primal, indefeasible, truths of Christianity,) shall not pass away, so I cannot presume to say that men may not attain to a clearer, at the same time more full and comprehensive and balanced, sense of those words, than has as yet been generally received in the Christian world. As all else is transient and mutable, these only eternal and universal, assuredly, whatever light may be thrown on the mental constitution of man, even on the constitution of nature, and the laws which govern the world, will be concentrated so as to give a more penetrating vision of those undying truths.

And I commend to the consideration of those of my Right Reverend Brethren, who have so strongly condemned me, these other words of the same eminent writer, *History of the Jews*, p.xxxiv:—

If on such subjects [as those here discussed] some solid ground be not found, on which highly educated, reflective, reading, reasoning, men may find firm footing, I can foresee nothing but a wide—a widening—I fear, an irreparable—breach between the thought and the religion of England. A comprehensive, all-embracing, Catholic, Christianity, which knows what is essential to religion, what is temporary and extraneous to it, may defy the world. Obstinate adherence to things antiquated, and irreconcilable with advancing knowledge and thought, may repel, and for ever,—how many, I know not,—how far, I know still less. Avertat omen Deus!

That portion of the work, however, which concerns the New Testament, I leave at present to others. The Bishops and Doctors of our Church are many, and I am but one. Several of them are learned in matters specially connected with the criticism of the N.T., with the early records of the history of the Church, and of the origin, progress, and development of dogmatic teaching within her pale. I must confine myself,—for the present, at least,—to the special work which I have here undertaken, and in which my

Brethren have left me hitherto to labour alone, *viz.* that of setting before the Laity and Clergy of the National Church, to the best of my power, the most certain conclusions of modern critics as to the age and authorship of the different parts of the Pentateuch.

. Since the above Preface was written, the Report of the Committee of the Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, appointed to examine Parts I and II of my work, has been presented, and endorsed by a vote of ten Bishops of the Province, at the earnest instance of the Bishop of OXFORD, but in opposition to the judgment of two of the most eminent and learned Bishops of the English Bench, the Bishops of LONDON and ST. DAVID'S.

I rejoiced at the appointment of that Committee. For the furtherance of the Truth I desired nothing more than that my investigations and conclusions should be brought under review by such a body of English Clergymen, distinguished, most of them, by high ecclesiastical position, and many of them by eminent literary and theological attainments. It is true that Archdeacon DENISON, who moved for the Committee, and has acted as its chairman,—who expressed the wish to 'avoid the appearance of approaching to intemperance in thought or language,' and who, therefore, in his preliminary address to the Convocation, confined himself to speaking of me merely as 'a sacrilegious person,' one ready to 'damage the Bible by misrepresentation, to tear out its leaves, mutilate it, and desecrate what is left,' adding, 'I am going to say, if any man asserts such things as are asserted in this book, *ANATHEMA ESTO!* Let him be put away!'—took for granted that many members of Convocation had not read the First Part of my work, and desired, apparently, that they should not read either Part for themselves, but simply accept the report of his Committee; for he said, 'I have no doubt,—at all events, I hope,—that there are many here, who have not read the First Part, and I am sure that there are many, who have not read the Second Part,' of the book, on which he was about to call them to pass some kind of judgment.

However, I presume that, at all events, those gentlemen, who have been engaged on this Committee, *have* felt it to be their duty to read my two Parts, and have endeavoured to divest themselves, as much as possible, of all prejudices, and to deliver 'a just and true verdict according to the evidence,' as in God's sight. I regret, indeed, that some of the most distinguished members of the Committee have taken no part at all in its proceedings, including two professors of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, and others, from whose learning and honesty of purpose I expected much advantage for the cause of Truth. Nevertheless, I accept the Report, as exhibiting the result of nine days' searching enquiry into the contents of my books, by fourteen clergymen, many of them eminent for piety and learning, who also, however strongly animated by the desire to bear witness to the Truth, and do nothing by partiality, yet had, many or most of them, spoken severely beforehand in censure of my writings, and would not, therefore, be likely to spare any traces of 'heresy' which might fairly be detected in them.

I observe, then, that the Committee has not reported that my criticisms are *unfounded* or my critical conclusions *false*. They do not impeach the scientific *truth*, but only the *orthodoxy*, of my reasonings; they leave to 'individuals' the business of replying to my books; and they say 'the work of a Synod of the Church is of a different kind.' As Archd. BICKERSTETH observed, 'They have simply taken expressions from the book, and placed them side by side with the Bible, and expressions from the Formularies and Articles.' To me it is of little consequence, comparatively, whether my conclusions are deemed to be orthodox or not, provided only that they are *true*. If so, they are 'orthodox' in the best sense—the only right sense—of the word, in the only one which is recognised by the whole *spirit* of our National Church, based, as it surely is, upon the Truth, and not on authority.

But the Committee of Convocation has reported that, 'bearing in mind that it is not their province to pronounce definitely what are, or are not, opinions heretical, they content themselves with submitting that *three* propositions, being the main propositions of the book, involve errors of the gravest and most dangerous character, subversive of Faith in the Bible as the Word of God.' They then 'proceed to cite from the book a further proposition,' which they evidently mean to characterise as 'heretical' and 'blasphemous.'

These four points, however, sum up the crimes, of which I am supposed to be guilty. Never, I presume, was any book subjected to the ordeal of a more searching scrutiny. And it may be safely concluded that such scrutiny has brought forth fully, into the strongest light, *all* the offences, with which, in the opinion of these eminent divines, my books can justly be charged.

I need hardly say, that I am glad to find that my offences are so few, and that upon the first three points complained of I am in substantial agreement with one of the most learned and distinguished members of Convocation itself, Dean MILMAN, of St. Paul's, and upon the fourth with two others, the latter of whom attended all the

meetings of this very Committee, Prof. HAROLD BROWNE and Dean ALFORD of Canterbury. Some passages from these authors have been already quoted in this Preface: but, under the circumstances of the case, it may be well to produce the most important of them again, and to contrast them with the charges made against me.

(i) I have said that '*The Bible is not itself God's Word*,' it being, however, added by me that 'assuredly God's Word will be heard in the Bible, by all who will humbly and devoutly listen for it.'

Dean MILMAN says, *Hist. of the Jews*, p.xi :—

'The moral and religious truth, and this alone, I apprehend, is the 'Word of God' contained in the Sacred Writings.'

(ii) I have said that '*Not Moses, but Samuel, and other persons of a later age, composed the Pentateuch*.'

Dean MILMAN says, *ibid.* p.xxvii :—

'There are two theories, between which range all the conclusions of what may be called the critical school :—

'First, that the Pentateuch in its present form is of *very late date*, the reign of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Josiah, or even subsequent to these ;

'Secondly, that the Pentateuch, even in its present form, is of *very high antiquity*, as high as the time of Moses, but that it *has undergone many interpolations, some additions, and much modification*, extending to the language, in successive ages.

'If I am to choose, I am most decidedly for the second.'

(iii) I have said that '*The story of the Pentateuch, with respect to some, at least, of the chief portions of the narrative, cannot be regarded as historically true*.'

Dean MILMAN says, *ibid.* p.xxvii :—

'Maintain the numbers [of the Pentateuch] as they stand, I see no way, without one vast continuous miracle, out of the difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities.'

The judgment of one such learned and devout historian, who gives the above results as the conclusions of thirty years' careful study of these questions, will weigh more, I imagine, with most intelligent and candid readers, than the mere denunciations of others, who have never thoroughly examined the subject, and are not really aware of its difficulties.

(iv) With respect to the *fourth* point, my words are reported as follows :—

'Our Lord Jesus Christ, having taken our nature fully, and having voluntarily entered into all the conditions of humanity, and, among others, into that which makes our growth in all ordinary knowledge gradual and limited, . . . at what period of his life upon earth is it to be supposed that He had granted to Him, as the *Son of Man*, supernaturally, full and accurate information, so that he should be expected to speak about the Pentateuch in other terms than any other devout Jew of that day would have employed? Why should it be thought that He would speak with certain *Divine* knowledge on this matter, more than upon other matters of ordinary science or history?'

And the Report goes on to say :—

'Your Committee observe upon this proposition that it questions our Blessed Lord's Divine knowledge, as witnessed in Scripture by the Holy Ghost.'

I think that, when my readers take account of the passages, which have been already quoted on this point in this Preface,—among which will be found the words of Prof. BROWNE and Dean ALFORD,—they will be surprised at the above statement. They will be surprised also to find that neither the Bishop of OXFORD, nor any one of the Bishops who voted with him, uttered one syllable to imply that he was aware of any such passages existing, or expressed a brotherly hope, that on this particular point, at all events, I might not be altogether so guilty as some have supposed. It is, I repeat, an amazing fact, that so many Bishops, Doctors, and Divines should have adopted this Report, without one single voice breaking the dead silence, to intimate that there was ever the slightest doubt in the Church upon this question,—still less, to give utterance to the simple truth, that here, at least, I am supported by the consentient opinion of very many of the greatest Divines, both ancient and modern.

J. W. NATAL.

23 SUSSEX PLACE, KENSINGTON, LONDON, W.

June 3, 1863.

PART III

THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

CHAPTER I.

THE DEUTERONOMIST DISTINCT FROM THE OTHER WRITERS OF THE PENTATEUCH.

505. THE course of our argument will lead us to consider next more closely the age and authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy. We may now assume that we are no longer under the necessity of regarding this portion of the Pentateuch as being an actual authentic record, by Moses himself or by one of his contemporaries, of the last addresses of the great Hebrew lawgiver to his people. In fact, if it be true, as we believe, that the other parts of the Pentateuch are, generally, of far later date than the time of the Exodus, there can be no reason *à priori* for supposing that this Book forms an exception to the general rule. And, as we have seen some ground for concluding that the original Elohist story has been very considerably enlarged in later days,—perhaps, by more than one author, in different ages,—it is, from the first, not improbable that the Book of Deuteronomy also, which, as we shall presently see, differs remarkably from the rest, not only in its *style* and *tone*, but also in its very *language*, and verbal *forms of expression*, may have been added in a still later age.

506. There can be no doubt that Deuteronomy is throughout the work of one and the same hand, with the exception of the last chapter, and, perhaps, one or two other short sections, (such as xxxii.48–52,) which will be

pointed out hereafter. Otherwise, the Book is complete in itself, and exhibits a perfect unity of style and subject. It consists chiefly of addresses ascribed to Moses shortly before his death; *viz.*—

(i) An introductory discourse, i.6–iv.40, in which he is represented as recounting to the people, by way of encouragement and warning, a brief sketch of their past history, after their escape out of Egypt, which discourse, however, as we have seen (261, 262), is interrupted, here and there, with geographical and archaeological notices, very ill-suited to such an occasion, and involves anachronisms, where reference is made to events of the previous weeks as to events of a bygone age, which betray at once the later time at which it was written;

(ii) The main body of the work, v.1–xxvi.19, a long and impressive address, urging upon the people, by reiterated arguments of the most earnest and affectionate kind, the duty and blessedness of obeying the Divine commands, and the danger of disobedience;

(iii) Additional addresses, xxvii.1–xxx.20, expressed in language of great eloquence, with powerful—almost, at times, appalling—energy, in which the people are warned, again and again, of the fearful consequences of departing from Jehovah;

(iv) The conclusion, xxxi.1–xxxiv.12, containing the ‘Song’ and last ‘Blessing’ of Moses, with the account of his death and burial ‘in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no

man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day,' xxxiv.6.

507. No attentive reader of the Bible can have failed to remark the striking difference above referred to, which exists between the style and contents of Deuteronomy and those of the other Books, generally, of the Pentateuch. These latter are occupied almost entirely with long details of legend or history, with circumstantial directions for the construction of the Tabernacle and its vessels, or with multiplied repetitions of the minutiae of the ceremonial Law; so that the writers only very occasionally break forth, from their usual plain, prosaic, style, into grand prophetic utterances, or soar into the higher regions of poetry.

508. But the Book of Deuteronomy, on the contrary, almost from beginning to end, is one magnificent poem, or collection of poems, full of noble thoughts and glowing expressions, containing scarcely a single lengthy detail of a purely *historical, artistic, or ceremonial*, nature, but wholly devoted to enforcing, the paramount duties of morality and religion, in tones of earnest and impassioned eloquence,—now with the most persuasive and touching tenderness, now with the most impressive and terrible denunciations.

509. Prof. RAWLINSON, indeed, writes, *Aids to Faith*, p.245:—

Considered as a literary work, the Pentateuch is not the production of an advanced or refined, but of a simple and rude, age. Its characteristics are *plainness, inartificiality, absence of rhetorical ornament*, and occasional defective arrangement. . . . *We look in vain through the Pentateuch for the gnomic wisdom of Solomon, the eloquent denunciations of Ezekiel or Jeremiah, or the lofty flights of Isaiah.*

This, seems, indeed, to be a very strange assertion. Surely, no one, after reading the glorious rhetoric of D.xxviii or D.xxxii, would hesitate for one moment to pronounce either of these passages to be one of the most 'eloquent denunciations,' and one of the most 'lofty flights' of prophetic, as well as of poetical, imagination, that can be found within the whole compass of sacred and profane literature. Most probably Prof. RAWLINSON was not really thinking, when he wrote the above words, of these chapters, or of the Book of

Deuteronomy at all. His language, in fact applies generally, with sufficient accuracy, to the other portions of the Pentateuch. And it is the marked contrast between the general plainness of style in these other Books, and the spirit and energy, the fire of holy zeal, the warmth of imagination, which characterize everywhere the Book of Deuteronomy, by which we are from the first, before instituting any closer enquiries, compelled strongly to the conviction that they cannot have had the same author or authors.

510. But it may, perhaps, be asked, 'Was not Moses himself capable of producing such a Book as this?' At the close of his long life, after so many awful communings with God,—being now, as it were, in the very hour of his own dissolution, with his bodily eye, indeed, still undimmed, and his natural force unabated, D.xxxiv.7, but with his feet already standing on the verge of the eternal world, and his spirit's eyesight straining into the darkness that lay before him,—is it wonderful that he should have felt the prophetic impulse seize him mightily, at such a time, with a power unknown before, and that he should have thus poured forth his dying utterances, of mingled laudation and reproof, encouragement and warning, blessing and cursing, in strains of unwonted force and eloquence?

511. Moses, too, it may be said, like Jacob of old, G.xlix.1-27, may here have gathered up the manifold and wonderful experiences of his life, in this last burst of grand, heart-stirring, oratory. No longer now occupied with the things of time,—the legends of hoar antiquity, the historical records of the events in the wilderness, the ritual of external worship, the requirements of the Camp and of the earthly Sanctuary,—we may well believe that he would have wished to have his last hours occupied, as here, with the enforcement of eternal realities,—of that worship in spirit and in truth, of which these earthly things are but the symbols,—so as to leave lingering in the ears and in the hearts of his people the echo of those words, which sum up

the whole substance of his previous teaching,—

'Hear, O Israel! Jehovah our God is One Jehovah; and thou shalt love Jehovah thy God with all thine heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy might,' D.vi.4,5,—

words, which One greater than Moses declared to contain the essence of all the Law and the Prophets, only adding from L.xix.18 the 'new command' of the Gospel, Matt.xxii.37—39—

'Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.'

512. This argument, might, indeed, have been employed, with some plausibility, to vindicate to Moses the composition of this Book, if we had not already seen that the story of the Exodus, generally, cannot be regarded as historically true,—if it were not also plain that the other Books of the Pentateuch must have been composed in a later age than that of Moses,—if, lastly, there were not, in the language of Deuteronomy itself, abundant indications that we have here a very different author, and one of a very different age, from those concerned in writing the main portions of the other books of the Pentateuch.

513. One very remarkable instance of this may be seen in the fact that, whereas in the other Books the Priests are repeatedly styled the 'sons of Aaron,' L.i.5,7,8,11,ii.2,iii.2,xiii.2, N.x.8, comp. L.xxi.21, N.xviii.1,9,11,19, and are *never once* called the 'sons of Levi,' yet in Deuteronomy, on the contrary, they are repeatedly called the 'sons of Levi' or 'Levites,' D.xvii.9,18,xviii.1,xxi.5,xxiv.8,xxvii.9,xxxi.9, — comp. xviii.1,5,xxxiii.8—11,—and *never once* the 'sons of Aaron.'

514. In fact, a very strong line of distinction is drawn between the Priests, the 'sons of Aaron,' and the 'Levites' or 'sons of Levi,' in the Book of Numbers throughout,—not only in the first portions, iii.9,10,iv.15,19,20,xvi.8—10,40,xviii.1—3,6,7, &c., but also at the very end of the forty years' wanderings,—see xxxi.28,29,41, compared with v.30,47. And so, in the fortieth year, we read of 'Eleazar, the son of Aaron the Priest,' xxv.7,11,xxvi.1, exactly as in xvi.37. It cannot be thought that any writer, whether Moses or any other, would so

suddenly change his form of expression in such a case as this, in the very short interval in question. And let it be noted that 'the Priests the Levites,' in D.xvii.9, and 'the Priests the sons of Levi,' in D.xxxi.9, are supposed to be the Priests then living, Eleazar, &c., the actual 'sons of Aaron.'

515. Bishop OLLIVANT, however, *Second Letter* to his Clergy, p.9, tries to explain the above fact as follows:—

When we find that the death of Aaron had been recorded in N.xxxiii.38, six months before one word of Deuteronomy was spoken, I think that we may well suppose, either that a sense of his own loss might have induced Moses to pass over his brother's name in silence (!), or that, Aaron being now no more, so that *his* feelings could not possibly be wounded by the change, the Lawgiver, remembering the jealousy of certain Levites, which had dictated the cry against himself and Aaron, 'Ye take too much upon you,' might deem it good policy, or even be directed by Jehovah Himself, to endeavour to extinguish a flame, suppressed, but perhaps not altogether extinguished, by henceforth adopting an appellation which referred rather to the common patriarchal ancestor of Priests and Levites, than to the family ancestor of Priests alone.

516. I leave the above to the consideration of my readers, merely observing that, though the death of Aaron is referred to in N.xxxiii.38, the *full account* of it is given in N.xx.22—29, after which we find the name of Aaron repeatedly mentioned—(by Moses, as is supposed)—e.g. in N.xxvi.64. Also in N.xxv.7,11,xxvi.1, we have, as above mentioned, the expression,—

'Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, the son of Aaron the Priest.'

So that, according to the history, neither the 'feelings' of Moses, nor his 'policy,' prevented his using the name of 'Aaron the Priest,' within six months after his death,—in his writings at all events,—for the instruction of the people.

517. Again, the Deuteronomist uses the word *Torah*, 'Law,' invariably of the *whole* Law, i.5,iv.8,44,xvii.11,18,19,xxvii.3,8,26, xxviii.58,61, xxix.20,28, xxx.10, xxxi.9,11,12,24,26, xxxii.46, xxxiii.4,10, and never of a single particular precept. But in the other Books the word is used most frequently,—indeed, almost always, (the exceptions being E.xiii.9,xvi.4, xxiv.12,)—of *par-*

ticular laws, E.xii.49, L.vi.9, 14, 25, vii.1, 7, 11, 37, xi.46, xii.7, xiii.59, xiv.2, 32, 54, 57, xv.32, N.v.29, 30, vi.13, 21, xv.16, 29, xix.2, 14, xxxi.21.

518. Also the Deuteronomist confines all sacrifices to *one place*, 'which Jehovah would choose, to put His Name there,' xii.5, 11, 13, 14, 18, 21, 26, xiv.23, 24, 25, xv.20, xvi.2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, xvii.8, 10, xviii.6, xxvi.2, xxxi.11. Whereas the other four Books say nothing about this, but expressly imply the contrary,—

'In *all places*, where I record my Name, I will come unto thee, and I will bless thee,' E.xx.24.

519. Further, the Deuteronomist, though he strictly enjoins the observance of the three Great Feasts and of the Passover,* xvi.1–17, yet makes no mention whatever of the 'Feast of Trumpets,' L.xxiii.23–25, N.xxix.1–6, or the 'Day of Atonement,' L.xxiii.26–32, N.xxix.7–11, on each of which days it was expressly ordered that they should 'do no servile work,' that they should have 'a holy convocation,' and that they should 'offer an offering made by fire unto Jehovah,' just exactly as at the three Great Feasts, and on the latter of which they were 'to afflict their souls by a statute for ever,' and it is added—

'Whosoever soul it be, that shall not be afflicted in that same day, he shall be cut off from among his people; and whosoever soul it be, that doeth any work in that same day, the same soul will I (Jehovah) destroy from among his people.' L.xxiii.29, 30.

520. Let it be borne in mind that the directions in N.xxix are supposed to have been laid down by Jehovah Himself only a few weeks previously to this address of Moses. Yet here, while making, as he is represented to be doing, a final summary of their duties, as to the observance of their annual sacred seasons, he omits all mention of these two important days, upon which the same stress is laid in L.xxiii as on the three Great Feasts, and for the neglect of one of which the punishment of death by the stroke of Divine judgment is threatened.

* The 'Passover' is evidently distinguished from the 'Feast of Unleavened Bread,' (with which it was connected,) in L.xxiii.5, 6, N.xxviii.16, 17.

521. Again, there are a number of sentiments or statements, repeated again and again by the Deuteronomist, which occur, most of them rarely, and many of them not at all, *e.g.* (v), (ix), (x), (xi), (xii), (xiv), (xv), in any of the other Books of the Pentateuch: *viz.*—

(i) That Israel should possess the land of nations 'greater and mightier' than itself, iv.38, vii.1, ix.1, xi.23; comp. i.28, vii.17, and also G.xviii.18, N.xiv.12;

(ii) That Jehovah had 'led them forty years' through the wilderness, viii.2, xxix.5; comp. i.31, ii.7;

(iii) That Jehovah is God and 'none else,' iv.35, 39, xxxii.39; comp. vi.4; whereas in the other Books this truth is not thus stated in plain terms, but rather the preeminence and excellence of Jehovah above all other gods is magnified, as it is also in D.x.17;

(iv) That obedience will be blessed with long life, and the contrary, iv.1, 40, v.16, 33, vi.2, viii.1, xi.21, xvi.20, xxv.15, xxx.6, 15–20, xxxii.47; comp. E.xx.12, xxiii.26, N.xiv.23, xxxii.11;

(v) That the statutes, &c., which Moses had taught them, were those which Jehovah had 'commanded him to teach them,' that they might 'do them in the land which Jehovah gave them,' iv.5, 14, v.31, vi.1, xii.1;

(vi) That they should 'teach their children' about Jehovah's doings, &c., iv.9, 10, vi.7, 20, &c., xi.19; comp. E.xii.26, xiii.8, 14;

(vii) That Mount Sinai 'burned with fire,' and Jehovah spake 'out of the midst of the fire,' iv.11, 12, 15, 33, 36, v.4, 5, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, ix.10, 15, x.4, xviii.16, xxxiii.2; it is mentioned in E.xix.18 that Jehovah 'descended on the mount in fire,' and in E.xxiv.17 that 'the appearance of the glory of Jehovah was like devouring fire;' but it is said, 'He called unto Moses out of the midst of the cloud,' and not, as in Deuteronomy, 'out of the midst of the fire';

(viii) That Jehovah would 'inherit Israel,' iv.20, ix.26, 29, xxxii.9; comp. E.xxxiv.9;

(ix) That they should not, when 'fat' and full with the good things of Canaan, 'corrupt themselves,' &c., iv.26, vi.10, &c., viii.10, &c., xi.15, &c., xxxi.20, xxxii.15, &c.;

(x) That idolatry in every form is specially 'abomination to Jehovah,' iv.25, xi.16, xxvii.15, xxviii.36, 64, xxix.17, xxx.17, xxxi.16, 20, xxxii.16, 17;

(xi) That Jehovah is to be served with inward, spiritual worship, 'with all the heart, and with all the soul,' iv.29, vi.5, x.12, xi.13, xiii.4, xxvi.16, xxx.2, 6, 10;

(xii) That Jehovah had 'chastened' (instructed) them, as a father his child, iv.36, viii.5, xi.2;

(xiii) That Jehovah 'would drive out,' iv.38, ix.4, 5, xi.23, xviii.12, 'cast out,' vi.19, vii.1, 22, ix.4, 'deliver,' vii.2, 23, xxxi.5, 'destroy,' vii.23, viii.20, ix.3, xxxi.3, 'cut off,' xii.29, xix.1, the nations before Israel; comp. E.xxxiii.23, 27, 30, 31, xxxiv.11, L.xviii.24;

(xiv) That Jehovah had brought out Israel 'by temptations, signs, wonders, &c.,' iv.34, vi.22, vii.19, xi.3, xxvi.8, xxix.2, 3;

(xv) That Israel should hear and observe to do Jehovah's commands, 'that it might be

well with them,' and that they might be multiplied, &c., vi.3, vii.13, viii.1, xiii.17, xxviii.63, xxx.16;

(xvi) That Israel should 'fear' Jehovah, vi.24, viii.6, xiv.23, xxviii.58; comp. L.xix.14,32, xxv.17,36,43;

(xvii) That Israel should 'smite,' vii.2, 'exterminate,' vii.2, xx.17, 'devour,' vii.16, 'destroy with a mighty destruction,' vii.23, 'drive out and destroy,' ix.3, 'leave nothing alive of,' xx.16, the nations of Canaan; comp. N.xxxiii.52,53;

(xviii) That the nations of Canaan would be likely to turn the Israelites to idolatrous practices, vii.4, xii.31, xx.18; comp. E.xxxiii.32, 33, xxxiv.12-16;

(xix) That Israel is 'holy unto Jehovah,' above all nations upon earth, vii.6, x.15, xiv.2,21, xxvi.19; comp. E.xix.6, L.xx.24,26;

(xx) That Jehovah would 'bless' them, if obedient, with plentiful supplies of food and all earthly blessings, vii.12-15, xi.13-15, xxviii.1-14; comp. E.xxiii.25, L.xxvi.4,5,10;

(xxi) That no man should 'stand' before Israel, vii.24, xi.25; comp. ix.2, E.xxiii.27;

(xxii) That Jehovah would 'go before' them, and lead them into the promised land, ix.3, xxxi.3;

(xxiii) That great impression may be expected to be made by capital punishments, xiii.12, xvii.13, xix.20, xxi.21.

CHAPTER II.

CHARACTERISTIC EXPRESSIONS OF THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

522. BESIDES the above phenomena, there is a mass of evidence of a similar kind, but still more satisfactory and convincing, from which it will appear that the language of Deuteronomy differs so remarkably from that of the other Books of the Pentateuch, that it cannot be believed that so great a change, as is implied by this difference, can have passed over the mind of Moses, or any other writer, in the course of a few days or weeks. We shall find, for instance, several expressions, which occur frequently and familiarly throughout the other four Books, but which never occur at all in Deuteronomy. And, on the other hand, we shall find a multitude of other words and turns of expression, which are used freely by the Deuteronomist, and were evidently favourites with him, but which never appear in the other four Books of the Pentateuch.

523. *Expressions used freely in the first four Books of the Pentateuch, but never occurring in Deuteronomy.*

(i) *akhuzzah*, 'possession, G.xvii.8,xxiii.4,9,20, xxxvi.43, xlvii.11, xlviii.4, xlix.30, l.13,

L.xiv.34,34, xxv.10,13,24,25,27,28,32,33,33,34, 41,45,46, xxvii.16,21,22,24,28, N.xxvii.4,7, xxxii.5,22,29,32, xxxv.2,8,28,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except in xxxii.49, and this verse belongs to v.48-52, which is evidently a passage of the older narrative, (referring to the death of Moses, and corresponding to N.xx.22-29, where the death of Aaron is described in similar terms,) inserted in this place by the Deuteronomist.

Instead of *akhuzzah*, the Deut. *always* uses *yêrûshah*, for 'possession,' ii.5,9,9,12,19,19, iii.20,—which word is *never* used in the first four Books of the Pentateuch.

(ii) *ish ish*, 'every man,' lit. 'man, man,' E.xxxvi.4, L.xv.2, xvii.3,8,10, xviii.6, xx.2,9, xxii.4,18, xxiv.15, N.i.4, iv.19,49, v.12, ix.10,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. *always* uses *ish*, only, i.16,41, iii.20, xii.8,xvi.17, xviii.19,xix.11,15,16,xxi.15,18, 22, xxii.13,22,25,26,28, xxiii.10, xxiv.1,5,7,16.

(iii) *gavah*, 'die,' G.vii.17, vii.21, xxv.8,17, xxxv.29, xlix.33, N.xvii.12,13, xx.3,29,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

(iv) *matteh*, 'tribe,' 96 times in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. *always* uses *sheret*, for 'tribe,' i.13,15,15,23, iii.13, v.23, x.8, xii.5,14, xvi.18, xviii.1,5, xix.8,10,18,21, xxxi.28,xxxiii.5.

(v) 'in the bone of this day,' = 'on the self-same day,' G.vii.13, xvii.23,26, E.xii.17,41,51, L.xiii.14,21,28,29,30,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.48, as above (i).

(vi) 'gathered to his people' = 'die,' G.xvv.8, 17, xxxv.29, xlix.29,33, N.xx.24,26, xxvii.13, 13, xxxi.2,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.15, as above (i).

(vii) 'That *soul* shall be cut off' from Israel, from his people, G.xvii.14, E.xii.15,19, xxx.33,38, xxxi.14, L.vii.20,21,25,27, xvii.4,9, xviii.29, xix.8, xx.17,18, xxii.3, xxiii.29, N.ix.13, xv.30, xix.13,20,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. says *always* 'that *man* shall die' or 'shall be stoned with stones,' and 'thou shalt put away (lit. 'burn up') the evil from the midst of you,' xiii.5, xvii.7,12, xix.13,19, xxi.9,21, xxii.21,22,24, xxiv.7.

(viii) *khok* or *khukkah*, 'ordinance,' in the singular, E.xv.25,xxx.21, L.vi.11,15, vii.34, x.15, N.xviii.8,11,19,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

(ix) 'land of Canaan,' G. (35 times), E.vi.4, xvi.35, L.xiv.34, xviii.3, xxv.38, N.xiii.2,17, xxvi.19, xxxii.30,32, xxxiii.40,51, xxxiv.2,27, 29, xxxv.10,14,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxxii.49, as above (i).

The Deut. uses twice the expression 'land of the Canaanites,' i.7, xi.30; but he generally uses some periphrasis, such as the 'land which Jehovah sware unto your fathers,' i.8,35, vi.10,18,23, vii.1, &c., the 'good land,' iii.25, iv.21,22, vi.18, viii.7,10, &c., the 'land which Jehovah giveth thee,' iv.1,21, v.31, &c., the 'land whither ye go over to possess it,' iv.5, 14,26, vi.1, vii.1, &c., the 'land that floweth with milk and honey,' vi.3, xi.9, xxvi.15, &c.

(x) *par*, 'bullock,' occurs 9 times in Exodus, 29 times in Leviticus, 52 times in Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. *always* uses *shor*, for 'bullock,' v.14,21, xiv.4, xv.19, xvii.1, xviii.3, xxi.1,4,10, xxv.4, xxviii.31, xxxiii.17.

(xi) '*plains of Moab*,' N.xxii.1, xxvi.3,63, xxxi.12, xxxiii.48,49,50, xxxv.1, xxxvi.13,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*, except xxiv.1,8, in the last chapter, a fragment of the older narrative.

The Deut. uses '*land of Moab*,' i.5, ii.9, xxix.1 (xxviii.69), xxxii.*49, xxxiv.5,6.

(xii) *hedah*, '*congregation*,' 15 times in Exodus, 12 times in Leviticus, 83 times in Numbers,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. *always* uses *kahal*, '*assembly*,' v.22, ix.10, x.4, xviii.16, xxxiii.1,2,2,3,8, xxxi.30. (xiii) *nasi*, '*prince*,' 71 times in Gen., Ex., Lev., and Num.,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

The Deut. *always* uses *rosh*, '*head*,' i.13,15, 15, v.23(20), xxix.10(9), xxxiii.5,21.

(xiv) '*in your (their, &c.) generations*,' G. xvii.9,12, E.xii.14,17,42, xvi.32,33, xxix.42, xxx.8,10,31, xxxi.13, L.iii.17,vi.18,x.9, xxii.3, xxxiii.14,21,41,xxiv.3,xxv.30,N.ix.10,x.8,xv.14, 15,21,23,xviii.23,xxxv.29; comp. G.vi.9,—*nowhere in Deuteronomy*.

(xv) So '*tent of the congregation*' occurs 34 times in Ex., 43 times in Lev., 56 times in Num.;

miškan, '*Tabernacle*,' 56 times in Ex., 3 times in Lev., 38 times in Num.;

hoduṭh, '*Testimony*,' 35 times in Ex., Lev., and Num.;

korban, '*offering*,' 78 times in Lev. and Num.;

but not one of these expressions is used by the Deuteronomist, though '*tent of the congregation*' occurs in D.xxi.14,14, and '*tent*' in v.15,15, a fragment of the older document.

524. It may, perhaps, be said, with respect to the instances last quoted, that the Deuteronomist did not use them, because he did not require them, not having occasion to mention the '*Tabernacle*,' '*Testimony*,' &c., in recording the addresses of Moses; though certainly, it would be strange that such long addresses should have really been delivered, in the course of which so many matters of the past history of the people are referred to, without the Tabernacle having been once mentioned. But this cannot, at all events, be said of most of the other instances, where we have shown that the Deuteronomist *did* require to use expressions synonymous with those above quoted, that are used so freely in the earlier Books, but where he did not use these latter formulae. It is plain, therefore, that, if he has everywhere abstained from using them, it was because they were not familiar to his pen, as they were to those of the other writers, and he fell naturally into

the employment of other more favourite forms of expression.

525. *Expressions used freely in Deuteronomy, but never occurring in the first four Books of the Pentateuch.*

(i) '*land of Moab*,' i.5, ii.9, xxix.1, xxxii.49, xxxiv.5,6;

(ii) '*make to inherit*,' i.38, iii.28, xii.10, xix.3, xxi.16, xxxi.7, xxxii.8;

(iii) '*go in to possess*,' '*come in, go in, go over, and possess*,' i.8, iv.1,5,14,22,26, vi.1,18, vii.1, viii.1, ix.1,5, x.11, xi.8,8,10,11,29,31, xii.29, xvii.14, xxxii.20, xxvi.1, xxviii.21,63, xxx.16,18, xxxi.13, xxxii.47; comp. i.21,39, ix.4,23, xxx.5;

(iv) '*that they may learn to fear Jehovah*,' &c., iv.10, xiv.23, xvii.19, xxxi.12,13;

(v) '*which Jehovah giveth thee for an inheritance*,' &c. (used of the land of Canaan), iv.21,38, xv.4, xix.10, xx.16, xxi.23, xxiv.4, xxv.19, xxvi.1;

(vi) '*remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt*,' v.15, xv.15, xvi.12, xxiv.18,22; comp. x.19;

(vii) '*words of this Law*,' xvii.19, xxvii.3,8,26, xxviii.58, xxix.29, xxxi.12,24, xxxii.46;

(viii) '*written in this Book, in this Book of the Law*,' &c. xxviii.58,61, xxix.20,21,27, xxx.10.

526. It will be seen that the above expressions have peculiar reference to the special circumstances, under which Moses is supposed to be addressing the people. And the frequent recurrence of some of them might, perhaps, be explained by the necessity which then constrained him to remind the people in his last address, again and again,—while yet beyond Jordan in the '*land of Moab*,' before they '*went in to possess the land which Jehovah gave them as an inheritance*,'—of certain main facts of their history, of the cruel '*service*' from which they had been delivered, of the laws which they had received out of '*the midst of the fire*,' and of their duty to '*fear Jehovah*,' and obey the '*words of the Law*,' which were now '*written in a Book*' for all future time. But the following instances are of a more general kind, and have no connection with the particular time at which Moses is supposed to be speaking. And, therefore, as they appear so frequently in Deuteronomy, it cannot be doubted that, if the same writer had written also the other Books, he must have made use occasionally, at least, of some of them.

527. *Additional Deuteronomistic ex-*

* This expression, as will be shown below, is a Deuteronomistic interpolation in the fragment of the older narrative, xxxii.48-52.

pressions, which never occur in the first four Books of the Pentateuch.

(i) 'that Jehovah thy God may bless thee,' &c., ii.7, xii.7, xiv.24,29, xv.4,6,10,14,18, xvi.10,15, xxiii.20, xxiv.19, xxx.16; comp. i.11, xxviii.8;

(ii) 'work of the hands,' ii.7, xiv.29, xvi.15, xxiv.19, xxvii.15, xxviii.12,xxx.9, xxxi.29;

(iii) 'cleave' to Jehovah, iv.4, x.20, xi.22, xiii.4, xxx.20;

(iv) 'provoke,' iv.25, ix.18, xxxi.29, xxxii.16,19,21,27;

(v) 'with all the heart and with all the soul,' iv.29, vi.5, x.12, xi.13, xiii.3, xxvi.16, xxx.2,6,10;

(vi) 'walk in the ways of Jehovah,' v.33, viii.6, x.12, xi.22, xix.9, xxvi.17, xxviii.9, xxx.16;

(vii) 'forget Jehovah,' vi.12, viii.11,14,19, xxxii.18; comp. iv.23;

(viii) 'abomination to Jehovah,' vii.25, xii.31, xvii.1, xviii.12, xxi.5, xxiii.18, xxv.16, xxvii.15;

(ix) 'which thou knewest not,' 'which thy fathers knew not,' &c., viii.3,16, xi.28, xiii.2,6,13, xxviii.33,36,64, xxix.26, xxxi.13, xxxii.17; comp. vii.15, ix.2;

(x) 'the stranger and the fatherless and the widow,' &c., x.18, xiv.29, xvi.11,14, xxiv.17,19,20,21, xxvi.12,13, xxvii.19;

(xi) 'burn up the evil from the midst,' xiii.5, xvii.7,12, xix.13,19, xxi.9,21, xxii.21, 22,24, xxiv.7;

(xii) 'innocent blood,' xix.10,13, xxi.8,9, xxvii.25.

528. We have given above only a few of the expressions peculiar to the Deuteronomist,—such as can be tested at once by the English reader, by a mere reference to the English Bible and Concordance. But in the larger edition we have shown that there are, at least, *thirty-three expressions*,—several of which are repeated *more than ten times* in Deuteronomy, and each of which is found on the average *eight times* in that Book,—*not one of which is found even once in any of the other four Books of the Pentateuch.*

And we have given also twelve other expressions, which occur three or four times in Deuteronomy, and nowhere else in the Pentateuch, such as these:—

(i) 'take good heed,' ii.4, iv.9,15, xxiv.8;

(ii) 'be strong and of good courage,' iii.28, xxxi.6,7,23;

(iii) 'hear and fear,' xiii.12, xvii.13, xix.20, xxi.21;

(iv) 'that shall be in those days,' xvii.9, xix.17, xxvi.3;

(v) 'all that do these things,' xviii.12, xxii.5, xxv.16;

(vi) 'forsake Jehovah, His Law, &c.' xxviii.20, xxxi.16, xxxix.25.

529. It is remarkable also how frequently the Deuteronomist uses such

phrases as 'Jehovah thy God,' 'Jehovah our God,' &c., compared with the other writers. The following Table shows how often the expressions, 'Elohim' or 'El,' 'Jehovah,' and 'Jehovah Elohim'—the first and third of these, (i) *without*, (ii) *with*, a pronoun (as 'thy Elohim,' &c.)—occur in each of the five Books of the Pentateuch. Of course, considerable allowance must be made for the fact that in Deuteronomy Moses is supposed to be speaking almost throughout, and, therefore, such expressions as 'Jehovah thy God,' 'Jehovah your God,' would naturally be used more frequently than in the other books. But the preponderance is still very noticeable.

	E.		J.		J.E.	
	(i)	(ii)	(i)	(ii)	(i)	(ii)
Genesis	200	1	135	28*	1	
Exodus.....	78	3	358	12	27†	
Leviticus	5	21	285	..	26†	
Numbers.....	23	4	390	1	6	
Deuteronomy..	33	3	234	8	308	

530. The conclusion to be drawn from the above facts, in addition to what has been produced of a similar character, appears to be irresistible. It seems to us *impossible* to believe that either Moses, or any other writer, could have had his whole tone of thought and expression so changed within a few days or weeks at the outside, as would be necessary to account for the above phenomena,—unless, indeed, it be supposed that a special miracle was wrought for the purpose of so modifying his language.

531. We shall assume it, therefore, henceforward, as a *fact that has been proved*, about which we need no longer have any doubt or uncertainty, that, whoever may have composed the Book of Deuteronomy, he was undoubtedly a different person from those, who were concerned in writing the main portions of the rest of the Pentateuch. Unless the preceding evidence be set aside, *this fact must stand good*, whatever else may be true, and whatever im-

* Of these 20 occur in G.ii,iii, 6 in G.xxiv.

† It is impossible at present to say how many of these may really be due to the Deuteronomist, as he may have revised the older document, and interpolated certain passages of his own in it.

portant consequences may follow from this conclusion.

532. But thus we find ourselves, at any rate, in this dilemma. If Moses *did* write Deuteronomy, then he did *not* write the last part of Numbers, which recounts the transactions of the last year of the wanderings, down to the very day on which the discourses in Deuteronomy are supposed to be uttered. And, if he did not write these chapters of Numbers, then he did not write a very large portion of the rest of the four Books; since no critic will deny that the same hand (hands), which composed the last seventeen chapters of Numbers, was (were) concerned also in writing a great part of the previous history. Hence, if Moses wrote the book of Deuteronomy, he certainly did *not* write the greater part of the other four Books. Or, if he did write the last part of Numbers, and the kindred matter in the other four Books, then he did *not* write the Book of Deuteronomy.

CHAPTER III.

FIRST APPROXIMATION TO THE AGE OF THE DEUTERONOMIST.

533. THE next question would naturally be, to ask in *what* age it is probable that the Deuteronomist lived. But, for the convenience of our argument, it will be best to defer for the present the full consideration of this part of the subject. Something, however, may be said at once towards satisfying the reader's mind on this point. It is plain that he must have lived *after* the other writers, since he refers throughout to passages in the story of the Exodus, which are recorded in the other books, and refers directly in xxiv.8 to the laws about leprosy in Leviticus. If, therefore, we are right in supposing from the evidence produced in Part II, that the Elohist and Jehovistic portions of the Pentateuch were written not earlier than the times of Samuel, David, and Solomon, it is plain, without further enquiry, that the Deuteronomist must have lived not earlier—and, probably, later—than the age of Solomon.

534. And this agrees with other prominent indications. Thus we have seen (513) that the Deuteronomist uses only the phrase 'Levites' or 'sons of Levi' for the Priests, and not 'the sons of Aaron.' Now the same expression is used of the Priests in that part of the book of Kings, which refers to the times of Jeroboam, 1K.xii.31:—

'And he made an house of high places, and made Priests indiscriminately of the people, (E.V. 'from the lowest of the people,') which were not of the sons of Levi.'

It is also the formula invariably used by *Jeremiah*, and the other later Prophets, Jer.xxxiii.18,21,22, Ez.xliii.19, xlv.15, xlviii.13, Mal.iii.3; comp. Mal.ii.4,8.

535. Again, the Deuteronomist uses *Torah*, in the singular *only* (517), and uses it of the whole Law. And so does *Jeremiah*, ii.8, vi.19, viii.8, ix.13, xvi.11, xviii.18, xxvi.4, xxxi.33, xxxii.23, xlv.10,23, Lam.ii.9.

Also the Deuteronomist confines all sacrifices to the place, where Jehovah 'would place His Name' (518). And so *Jeremiah* speaks repeatedly of Jerusalem or the Temple, as the place called 'by the Name' of Jehovah, vii.10,11, 14,30, xxv.29, xxxii.34, xxxiv.15; comp. iii.17, vii.12.

536. Let us now refer to (523).

(i) The Deuteronomist uses *yêrushah*, instead of *akhuzzah*, for 'possession;' and so does *Jeremiah*, xxxii.8.

(ii) The Deuteronomist employs *ish*, and not *ish ish*, for 'every man;' and so do the Prophets universally, e.g. Jer.i.15, vi.3, ix.4(3),5(4), xi.8, xii.15, &c.—except the post-Captivity Prophet Ezekiel in two instances, xiv.4,7.

(iii) The Deuteronomist never uses *gavah* for 'die,' although the word is often used in the older document; and the Prophets only use it in two instances, Lam.i.19, Zech.xiii.8.

It would appear that the above expressions had become antiquated and nearly obsolete in the days of the Prophets, and, probably, in those of the Deuteronomist.

(iv) The same may be true of *matteh* for 'tribe,' which is found in one place only of all the Prophets, Hab.iii.9, (and even here the expression is obscure); while *sheret*, the word used by the Deuteronomist, occurs in Hos.v.9, Is.xix.13, xlix.6, lxxiii.17, eleven times in Ezekiel, and in Zech.ix.1.

(v) 'on the self-same day,' is found only in Ez.ii.3, xxiv.2,22, xl.1.

(vi) 'gathered to his people,' (vii) 'that soul shall be cut off,' (viii) *khukkah*, 'ordinance,' in the singular, (ix) *nasi*, 'prince,' (xiv) 'in your &c., generations,' which are not found in Deuteronomy, occur nowhere in the Prophets, except the last (37 times) in Ezekiel.

537. The other expressions noticed in (523), as employed in the older document but not by the Deuteronomist, seem not to have become antiquated and out of use in the days of the Prophets, except those in (xv), which refer especially to the state of things in the wilderness, as 'Tent of the Congregation,' 'Tabernacle,' 'Testimony,' which never occur in their writings, any more than in that of the Deuteronomist; and this is almost the case with *Korban*, 'offering,' which is found only in Ez.xx.28, xl.43.

538. Upon the whole, it will be plain that the evidence just produced, though we do not press it as *conclusive* upon the point under consideration, *tends*, however, to establish a connection in point of time between the Deuteronomist and the later Prophets. And in the larger edition several instances are given, in which the Deuteronomist makes use of expressions, which are either *only* found in the latest books of the Bible, as the post-Captivity prophets and historians, or in none before the time of *Jeremiah*, e.g.—

(i) 'to speak rebellion against Jehovah,' D.xiii.5, Jer.xviii.16, xxix.32, comp. *Is.** lix. 13.—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

(ii) 'for a removing,' D.xxviii.25, Jer.xv.4, xxiv.9, xxix.18, xxxiv.17, Ez.xlii.46, 2 Ch. xxix.8.

(iii) 'stubbornness of heart,' D.xxix.19(18), Jer.iii.17, vii.24, ix.14(13), xl.8, xlii.10, xvi.12, xviii.12, xxiii.17, Ps.lxxxi.12(13),—*nowhere else in the Bible.*

539. It will be noticed that, in the above expressions, the Prophet *Jeremiah* agrees with the Deuteronomist. And, in like manner, it will be found that almost all the expressions in (527), which are found repeatedly in Deuteronomy, but do not occur in any other Book of the Pentateuch, are also found more or less freely used in *Jeremiah*.

(i) 'that Jehovah thy God may bless thee,' Jer.xxxi.23.

(ii) 'work of the hands,' Jer.i.16, x.3, xxv. 6,7,14, xxxii.30, xliv.8, Lam.iii.64, iv.2.

(iii) 'cleave' to Jehovah, Jer.xiii.11.

* We use *Is.* to denote the writings of the later Isaiah, the 'unknown Prophet,' to whom chap.xl-xvi of the present book of Isaiah must be assigned. That some, at least, of these prophecies were uttered after the Captivity, is obvious from such passages as lxiii.17-19, lxiv.10,11.

(iv) 'provoke,' Jer.vii.18,19, viii.19, xl.17, xxv.6,7, xxxii.29,30,32, xliv.3,8.

(v) 'with all the heart and with all the soul,' Jer.xxxii.41, comp. iii.10, xxiv.7, xxix. 13.

(vi) 'walk in the ways of Jehovah,' Jer.vii. 23.

(vii) 'forget Jehovah,' Jer.ii.32, iii.21, xlii. 25, xviii.15, xxiii.27.

(viii) 'abomination to Jehovah,' not in Jer., nor anywhere else in the Bible, except *Is.i.13*, and repeatedly in the book of Proverbs; but comp. Jer.xliv.4, and see 'abomination' in Jer.ii.7, vi.15, vii.10, viii.12, xvi.18, xxxii.35, xliv.22.

(ix) 'which thou knewest not, &c.,' Jer.v. 15, vii.9, ix.16(15), xiv.18, xv.14, xvi.13, xvii.4, xix.4, xxii.28, xxxiii.3, xliv.3.

(x) 'the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, &c.,' Jer.vii.6, xxii.3, comp. v.28, xlix.11.

(xi) 'burn up the evil from the midst,' not in Jer., but in 2K.xxiii.24, which many (557.v.) ascribe to Jeremiah.

(xii) 'innocent blood,' Jer.vii.6, xxii.3,17, xxvi.15, comp. xix.4.

540. So, too, many of those in (525) find their representatives in his prophecies, though with some of them, from the nature of the case, it could hardly have been expected.

(i) 'land of Moab,' Jer.xlviii.24,33.

(ii) 'make to inherit,' Jer.iii.18, xii.14.

(iii) 'which ye go in to possess,' &c., Jer. xxxii.23.

(iv) that they may 'learn to fear Jehovah,' &c., not in Jer.; but comp. 'to fear me all the days,' D.iv.10, Jer.xxxii.39.

(v) 'which Jehovah giveth thee for an inheritance,' Jer.xvii.4.

(vi) 'remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt,' not in Jer.

(vii) 'words of this Law,' comp. Jer.vi.19.

(viii) 'written in this Book,' &c., Jer.xxv. 13.

541. The above agreement in phraseology is certainly remarkable. And, if further evidence tends to confirm the indications, which we have already observed, of the *late* origin of the book of Deuteronomy, there is enough here to raise a strong suspicion that *Jeremiah* may have been its author, or, at all events, some later Prophet, moving in the same circle of religious ideas, and habitually using the same forms of expression as *Jeremiah*.

542. It is plain, however, that the above phenomena are just what we might expect to find in documents differing from one another in age by some considerable interval of time. The first four Books of the Pentateuch were written mainly, as we have seen reason to believe (468-471) by persons

living nearly in the same age, and in the same literary circle. While, therefore, we should expect to find the different parts of these Books, which are due to different writers, exhibiting characteristic differences in style and tone, and even betraying, by incidental allusions, the different circumstances of the times in which they were written, yet, if our view be correct, we should not be able to detect any marked distinction between the *Hebrew* of the Elohist and Jehovistic authors, any more than between the *English* of men of letters of our own country, who may have lived in the reigns of George III and Queen Victoria.

543. On the other hand, we should expect to perceive a more decided difference between good English compositions of the *Elizabethan* and writings of the *present* age, even though the spelling of the former were modernised. Thus words and expressions would most probably have been used by the older writers, which have now become antiquated; while the latter would be found to give signs of the possession of a more copious vocabulary, would be likely to employ a more free and flowing style, and to make use of new words and new expressions, reflecting the spirit and practices of their time. And just such a difference as this is found to exist between the first four Books, generally, of the Pentateuch and the book of Deuteronomy.

544. We have said 'the first four Books, generally.' For it must now be observed that, besides the numerous formulæ above noticed, not one of which is found in the first four Books of the Pentateuch, there are several other similar expressions, which occur freely in all parts of Deuteronomy, but are found also in *certain well-defined portions* of the other Books; that is to say, they do not appear in *all* parts of those Books, as they do in Deuteronomy, but *only* in certain particular sections, which are limited in extent, and which betray also, when carefully examined, other close affinities with the style of the Deuteronomist. We can scarcely doubt that such passages are interpolations by his hand.

545. And, indeed, it would be very strange if there were no such insertions as these. The writer, who could conceive the grand idea of adding the whole book of Deuteronomy to the existing roll of the Tetrateuch, would be almost certain, we may well believe, to have first revised the work of the older writers which had come into his hands, and to have inserted passages, here and there, if he saw any reason for so doing, in the original document. The wonder, we repeat, would be, if he did not do this.

For the present, however, it is unnecessary to point out and investigate these passages, which will come more properly under consideration hereafter. It will suffice to have drawn attention here to the fact of their existence.

CHAPTER IV.

THE BOOK OF THE LAW FOUND IN THE TEMPLE.

546. IN 2K.xxii.xxiii, we find an account of the following remarkable occurrence.

'In the eighteenth year of king Josiah, the king sent Shaphan the scribe to the House of Jehovah, saying, Go up to Hilkiyah the High Priest, that he may sum the silver which is brought into the House of Jehovah, which the keepers of the door have gathered of the people. . . . And Hilkiyah the Priest said unto Shaphan the scribe, *I have found the Book of the Law in the House of Jehovah.* And Hilkiyah gave the Book to Shaphan, and he read it. . . . And Shaphan the scribe shewed the king, saying, Hilkiyah the Priest hath delivered me a Book. And Shaphan read it before the king. And it came to pass, when the king had heard the words of the Book of the Law, that he rent his clothes. And the king commanded Hilkiyah the Priest, &c. saying, Go ye, enquire of Jehovah for me, and for the people, and for all Judah, concerning the words of this Book that is found; for great is the wrath of Jehovah that is kindled against us, because our fathers have not hearkened unto the words of this Book, to do according to all that which is written concerning us. . . . And the king sent, and they gathered unto him all the elders of Judah and of Jerusalem. And the king went up into the House of Jehovah, and all the men of Judah, and all the inhabitants of Jerusalem with him, and the Priests, and the Prophets, and all the people, both small and great; and he read in their ears all the words of the Book of the Covenant, which was found in the House of Jehovah. And the king stood by a pillar, and made a covenant before Jehovah, to walk after Jehovah, and to keep His commandments, and His testimonies, and His statutes, with all their heart and with

all their soul, to perform the words of this Covenant that were written in this Book. And all the people stood to the Covenant.'

547. If we met with the above narrative in any other book than the Bible, it would be natural to wish to examine more closely into the statement, and see what this occurrence really means, by which the young king was influenced to take in hand so strenuously the Reformation of Religion throughout the land. The High-Priest 'finds' this Book of the Law in the Temple. If it really had been written by Moses, where, we might ask, had it been lying all this while, during more than eight centuries?

548. It could not have been *in* the Ark; for then Hilkiah would not have 'found' it, as he dared not look into the Ark: and, besides, we are expressly told that there was 'nothing in the Ark save the two tables of stone,' 1K.viii.9. Nor could it have been lying for those eight centuries *beside* the ark. For then, surely, it would have been named among the things, that were brought into the Temple by Solomon; and, at all events, it would have been well known to David and Solomon and other pious kings, as well as to the successive High Priests, and we should not find them so regardless of so many of its plain precepts, as the history shows them to have been, *e.g.* with respect to the worshipping on high places, and the neglect of the due observance of the Passover.

549. When, further, we consider that in this same Book of Deuteronomy is found also the command, said to have been given by Moses to the Levites, xxxi.26,—

'Take this Book of the Law, and put it *beside* (E.V. 'in the side of,' but see R.ii.14, 'she sat *beside* the reapers,' 1S.vi.8, 'in a coffer *by the side* thereof,' &c.) the Ark of the Covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee,'—

it is scarcely possible to resist the suspicion that the writing of the Book, the placing it, and the finding it, were pretty nearly contemporaneous events; and that, if 'there was no king before Josiah,'—not David, in his best days, nor Solomon, in his early youth,—not Asa, nor Jehoshaphat, nor Hezekiah,—

'that turned to Jehovah with all his heart, and with all his soul, and with all his might, according to all the Law of Moses,' 2K.xlii.25,

—it may have been because there was no king before him who had ever seen *this* portion, at least, of the Pentateuch, or had believed that such parts of it, as had come into his hands, were really authoritative, and binding upon himself and his people, as containing the direct utterances of the Divine Will.

550. And this suspicion seems to be confirmed into a certainty, when we call to mind the proofs which we have already had before us, that Deuteronomy was written in a later age than the rest of the Pentateuch, and when we consider more closely the account which is given us of the finding of this 'Book of the Law.' For, first, it could hardly have been the *whole* Pentateuch, that Hilkiah now found. He gave it, we are told, to Shaphan, and Shaphan 'read it,'—perhaps, read only part of it,—or, as the Chronicler says, 'read *in* it,' 2Ch.xxxiv.18,—before he returned to the king on the business, about which he had been sent to the Temple. And Shaphan read it also before the king, and appears to have read to him *all* the words of the Book.

551. But, at all events, the next day again,—perhaps, the same day,—the king himself, we are told, read in the ears of the people—

'all the words of the Book of the Covenant, which was found in the House of Jehovah.'

It cannot be supposed that he would read on this occasion all the histories in Genesis, the long account of the construction of the Tabernacle and its vessels, or the details of the Levitical Law. Besides, the Book found by Hilkiah is repeatedly called the 'Book of the Covenant,' 2K.xxiii.2,3,21, which name can scarcely have been used of the whole Pentateuch, though it very well applies to Deuteronomy, or to the chief portion of that Book, since we find it written, D.xxix.1,—

'These are the words of the Covenant, which Jehovah commanded Moses to make with the Children of Israel in the land of Moab, *beside* the Covenant which He made with them in Horeb.'

552. Again, this 'Book of the Law,' which was found by Hilkiah, contained

also directions about the Passover, 2K.xxiii.21, such as we find in D.xvi. 1-8, and severe denunciations of the Divine displeasure against all who transgressed the commands contained in it, 2Kxxii.13, such as we find in D.xi.16,17, xxix.18-28, xxx.15-20, and, especially, in D.xxviii.15-68. And it led directly to the putting down, with a strong hand, of every kind of idolatrous practice, of all groves, high places, altars, &c., as we read in 2K. xxiii.24:—

‘Moreover the familiar spirits, and the wizards, and the images, and the idols, and all the abominations, that were spied in the land of Judah and in Jerusalem, did Josiah put away, that he might perform the words of the Law, which were written in the Book, that Hilkiah the Priest found in the House of Jehovah.’

And this too was in accordance with the commands of the Book of Deuteronomy, xii.2,3, xiii, xvi.21,22, xvii.2-7, xviii.10-12.

553. In short, the whole description of the nature and effect of the words contained in this ‘Book of the Law,’ which was read in the ears of the people, shows that it must have been the Book of Deuteronomy. Accordingly, we have seen already, and shall see yet more plainly, as we proceed, that there are internal signs in this Book, which tend to fix the date of its composition to somewhere about this period in the Jewish history.

554. It was, we may believe, the desire of Hilkiah, and, perhaps, of men of yet higher mind about the young king, to take advantage of his own religious and impressible spirit, and of the humbled state of the people, when Judah had been brought low through the oppressions of Manasseh, and the ten tribes had been carried into captivity, to abolish once for all the idolatrous practices which had so long prevailed, and to try to bind the hearts of the remnant of Israel to the Court and to the Temple at Jerusalem. And so there ensued at once, upon the discovery of this ‘Book of the Law,’ a complete Reformation of Religion throughout the land, with a thorough and violent rooting up of all idolatrous practices, as described in 2K.xxiii.

555. And then a great Passover was held by the king in Jerusalem. For once, it would seem, the attempt was made to draw the great body of the people thither: and never, we are told,—

‘from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the Kings of Israel, nor of the Kings of Judah,’—

was such a Passover held, as this that was held in the eighteenth year of king Josiah. But *we have no sign whatever of any other such Passover being held even in the reign of Josiah.* Perhaps, after a time, the young king also became aware of the real facts of the case, and his zeal may have been damped by this discovery. At all events, we hear no more of any such gatherings.

556. *Nor is there the least indication that the other two Feasts were kept by Josiah with similar solemnity in that very same year.* And yet the Law is laid down with equal distinctness for all three Feasts in E.xxiii.17, xxxiv.23,24. And according to these laws,—

‘Three times in the year all thy males shall appear before Jehovah,’—

it was just as necessary that they should go up to Jerusalem at the Feast of Pentecost, and especially at the Feast of Tabernacles,—at which, once in seven years, the Law was to be read in the ears of the assembled people, D.xxxi. 10-13,—as at the Passover.

CHAPTER V.

THE BOOK FOUND IN JOSIAH'S REIGN, THE BOOK OF DEUTERONOMY.

557. WE shall reserve for the present the full discussion of the very interesting question, to which we have before referred (539-541), and which was first raised by von BOHLEN, viz., whether the book of Deuteronomy is to be ascribed to the hand of *Jeremiah*, who was himself a Priest, the son of Hilkiah, Jer.i.1, and was called to the Prophetical office in the ‘thirteenth year’ of the reign of king Josiah, v.2, five years before the discovery of the Book of the Law in the ‘eighteenth year of his reign,’ 2K.xxii.3.

558. But we shall here consider what

HÄVERNICK says on the subject of this 'discovery.' *Pent.* p. 407-413.

'DE WETTE has come to the conclusion that, 'in the discovery of the Book of the Law in the Temple, the first certain trace of the existence of a Mosaic Book is to be found.' But the following considerations speak most decidedly against this.

(i) 'The very words, 'I have found the Book of the Law,' &c., clearly show the contrary. How could the High Priest use these words in delivering the Book to Shaphan, supposing that the latter knew nothing at all about it? Both individuals, on the contrary, are so well acquainted with it, that it only requires to be designated by this its known name, for one to know what it is.'

Ans. We believe that the greater portion of the first four Books of the Pentateuch had long been composed, and that the fact was known, more or less, to the more eminent men of the day, and even to the people generally, that some 'written Law' at one time existed. Perhaps, in the time of Josiah's idolatrous grandfather, Manasseh, or even before his time, the roll of the Pentateuch, or, rather, as we believe, the Tetrateuch, had disappeared. It may have been lying, little heeded or even noticed, among the archives of the Temple, and so came into the hands of the successive High Priests, until it reached those of Hilkiah, and those of the Deuteronomist.

(ii) 'The conduct of the king and of the Court is inexplicable, supposing that they now for the first time heard news of this Book. We find no sign in the narrative of mistrust or astonishment on their part at the existence of such a Book. Would the king have been seized with such terror, when he heard the words of this Book? Would he immediately have adopted such energetic measures, if he had not recognised it at once as authentic?'

Ans. No doubt, the king believed it to be authentic. He, too, was aware that some such a Book had once existed; and if, for some time past, the Book of Deuteronomy was, as we suppose, in actual process of composition, we may be sure that measures would have been taken to keep alive in his thoughts, and in the thoughts of others, the remembrance of that fact, until the day of the 'discovery.'

This would explain fully the words of Hilkiah just considered, 'I have found the Book of the Law in the House of Jehovah,' as well as the apparent want of surprise on the part both of Shaphan and the king,—*apparent*, we say, because none, at all events, is betrayed in the Scripture narrative, whatever may have been really the case.

(iii) 'Further, the narrative says not a word of the king's astonishment respecting the existence of the Book, but only respecting its contents, and the long non-observance of the Law and the refractory opposition to it. When he complains that the fathers had not acted according to it, it is evident that he must have been convinced that the Law was known and accessible to them.'

Ans. No doubt: this precisely agrees with our own view of the previous existence of the

first four Books of the Pentateuch. But, let it be well observed, the contents of those first four Books are of a very different character from those of Deuteronomy. They consist mainly, as we have said, of historical narratives, or ceremonial directions, while thirteen whole chapters of Exodus are devoted to the minute description of the details of the construction and setting up of the Tabernacle. In Deuteronomy it is the *moral Law* which is delivered throughout, in some of the most impressive language that has ever been written.

(iv) 'It would also, assuredly, be a decidedly false conclusion, to infer a general non-acquaintance with the Pentateuch from the circumstance of the king's betraying an ignorance of its contents. In such a Court as must have existed during the long reign of Manasseh, does not such an ignorance appear quite probable, and admit of being so explained?'

Ans. Josiah had already reigned *seventeen* years, and, when he came to the throne, he was too young,—indeed, only eight years old, 2K.xxii.1,—to have been very much influenced by the state of things in the Court of Manasseh,—laying out of consideration the story, which the Chronicler gives us, of Manasseh's deep repentance and reformation, 2Ch.xxxiii.12-16, according to which he must have restored the Law, (supposed by the Chronicler to have been in full operation in the days of his father Hezekiah, 2Ch.xxx.5,16, xxxi.3,21.) if he knew of it. But, according to the more authentic history of the book of Kings, Josiah from the first 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, and walked in all the ways of David his father,' 2K.xxii.2; and from his youth he must have been, we may believe, in these early days of his reign, greatly under the influence of the High Priest, Hilkiah. If, then, during the first seventeen years of his reign, this pious young king was all the while ignorant of the contents of the 'Book of the Law,' as HÄVERNICK admits, it is surely inconceivable that the people generally were better informed about it, whatever may have been the case with the few individuals, who were privy to the present movement. And, indeed, the whole story of the reading of the Book to the people, 2K.xxiii, implies this.

(v) 'But the opposite of this conclusion may be proved convincingly (1) from the narrative itself. The king sends a message to the Prophetess, Huldah, and makes enquiry of her respecting the 'Book' and its declarations. She then at once confirms the truth of those words by a Prophetic declaration, and *evidently knows the Book that is spoken of*, for she says, 'All the words of this Book, wherein the king hath read, shall be fulfilled.'

Ans. Upon HÄVERNICK's supposition, how could Huldah have known the Book? If she knew it, why did not Hilkiah the High Priest, and the King himself, know it? It is clear that the idea cannot be maintained. It would be more reasonable to say that she recognised the words of the Book, when she heard them, (as she might have heard them from the messengers sent to consult her,) as *Divine words*, or that she may have given her attestation to the Book by prophetic instinct. But, ac-

cording to our view, Huldah, most probably, did know the Book; for she was in the secret, and shared the hope of a great Reformation.

And this may seem, at first sight, to be confirmed by the fact, that she actually makes verbal references to favourite expressions of the Deuteronomist. Thus in 2K.xxii.17 we read 'that they might *provoke me to anger through all the work of their hands*,' as in D.xxxi.29, 'to *provoke Him to anger through the work of his hands*.' And we have also the following resemblances;

- (a) v.17, 'forsake' Jehovah (528.vi.);
- (b) 'other gods,' D.v.7, vi.14, vii.4, viii.19, xi.16,28, xiii.2,6,13, xvii.3, xviii.20, xxviii.14, 36,64, xxix.26, xxx.17, xxxi.18,20, and also E.xx.3, xxiii.13, xxxiv.14;
- (y) 'provoke' (527.iv.);
- (d) 'work of the hands' (527.ii.);
- (e) v.19, *shammah*, 'desolation,' (E.V. 'astonishment,') D.xxviii.37, *nowhere else in the Pentateuch*;
- (z) *kēlalah*, 'curse,' D.xi.28,29, xxi.23, xxiii.5, xxvii.13, xxviii.15,45, xxix.27, and also G.xxvii.12,13.

These coincidences can hardly be *accidental*. And, if we could be sure that the text really records the words of Huldah, they would show decisively that she must have been familiar with the Book of Deuteronomy, and, therefore, as she could not have known it, in the usual way, as a Book publicly known, (since then the King and High Priest must have known it also,) it would follow beyond a doubt that she knew it *privately*,—that there was some such a course pursued as we have supposed, and that Huldah was privy to it. But it is very possible that these are not really the words of Huldah, but those ascribed to her by the writer of the narrative. We have suggested (539-541) that *Jeremiah* may have been the Deuteronomist, and the reasons which lend support to this conjecture shall be produced in due time; and we also believe, with many critics, that the latter part of the Second Book of Kings may have been written by this Prophet, who was contemporary with the events described in it. Thus Dr. DAVIDSON, ii.37, while not giving his own assent to this hypothesis, observes—'According to the Talmudists, followed by many of the older theologians, Jeremiah was the compiler of the Book of Kings. This opinion has been adopted in modern times by HÄVERNICK and GRAF, &c.'

The many points of coincidence between this passage, 2K.xxii.16-20, and *Jeremiah*, as well as Deuteronomy, are, indeed, remarkable, as follows:—

- (a) v.17, 'forsake Jehovah,' Jer.i.16,ii.13,17, 19,v.7,19,ix.13,xvi.11,11,xviii.13,xix.4,xxii.9.
- (b) 'other gods,' Jer.i.16, vii.6,9,18,xi.10, xiii.10,xvi.11,13,xix.4,13,xxii.9,xxv.6,xxxii.29, xxxv.15, xlv.3,5,8,15.
- (y) 'provoke,' Jer.vii.18,19, viii.19, xi.17, xxv.6,7, xxxii.29,30,32, xlv.3,8.
- (d) 'work of the hands,' (539.ii.)
- (e) *shammah*, 'desolation,' Jer.ii.15, iv.7, v.30, &c., *twenty-four* places.
- (z) *kēlalah*, 'curse,' Jer.xxiv.9, xxv.18, xxvi.6, xxix.22, xlii.18, xlv.8,12,22, xlix.13.

The full phrase 'burn incense to other gods' occurs in Jer.i.16, xix.4, xlv.5,8,15, and no-

where else in the Bible, except in the duplicate of the passage now before us, 2Ch.xxxiv.25.

Also the complete phrase 'desolation and a curse' occurs in Jer.xxv.18, xlii.18, xlv.12,22, and *nowhere else in the Bible*,—though the two words occur separately in Deuteronomy.

If this second conjecture be true, it would be easy to account for Jeremiah's putting his own expressions into the mouth of Huldah.

(vi) 'Hence the Prophetess Huldah must have had a share in the 'concerted scheme.' But we meet here with a fresh confirmation of our view. Not only does the Prophetess give confirmation to the Book that has been discovered, but it is also read out of, in presence of the Priests, the Prophets, and the whole people! What a conjoint plot must this 'concerted scheme' have been! Who were the persons deceived here, since all appear to have nothing else in view than to deceive?'

Ans. It is obvious that very few beside the writer may have been privy to the scheme,—perhaps, only the Priest Hilkiah, and, possibly, Huldah, and one or two others.

(vii) 'The relations between the Priests and Prophets of that age were not exactly of the kind that will allow us to imagine such a combination, (see Jer.viii.8,) in which both parties joined hand in favour of falsehood, which the Prophets on other occasions so unsparingly expose and rebuke.'

Ans. Jer.viii.8 does not refer to the time of Hilkiah. But, as we have said, there is no reason to suppose that the Priests and Prophets, *generally*, were privy to the affair.

(viii) 'We must accordingly suppose that, in the time of Josiah, even according to our narrative, the 'Book of the Law' was by no means generally unknown, and that it is only the king in particular that betrays an ignorance of its contents, yet without showing a total ignorance of the existence of the Book.'

Ans. Rather, it seems impossible—if the people, generally, had knowledge of the contents of the Book,—that, at the same time, the king,—such a king as Josiah, who from his youth 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah,' 2K.xxii.2,—should have been totally ignorant of them. It is probable that both king and people knew of a written Law having once existed.

(ix) 'This circumstance rises to a still greater certainty, when we consider that, even before the finding of that Book, the king had made reforms with regard to the idolatry which had prevailed to a great extent.'

Ans. This fact, if true, would only make it more inconceivable than ever that the king should have been more ignorant of the contents of the Book than his idolatrous people were. But the account of this earlier attempt of Josiah, for the Reformation of Religion in his land, rests only on the unsupported statement of the Chronicler, who says that 'in his eighth year he began to seek after the God of David his father, and in the *twelfth* year he began to purge Judah and Jerusalem from the high places and the groves, and the carved images, and the molten images,&c.' 2Ch.xxxiv.

3-7,—in fact, carrying out at that early age, of his own mere motion, the very Reformation, which, according to the more trustworthy Book of Kings, only *followed* the finding and reading the 'Book of the Law.'

(x) 'Josiah does know that there is a 'Book of the Law,' and he is partially acquainted, probably by tradition, with the matter of its contents, as is shown by his obeying its Commandments. But now, by a remarkable occurrence,—the discovery of the Temple copy,—his knowledge of it is not only made complete, but a powerful impression is also produced on his heart; it now becomes the purpose of his life to live as far as possible according to such a Law in its entire extent. In this way, the whole history of the occurrence and the life of the king stand in perfect accordance with each other.'

Ans. The only reason for supposing that Josiah was 'partially acquainted with the contents of the Book,' is, as HÄVERNICK says, the fact, that he is represented as 'obeying its commandments' in the purging of his land from idolatries. But this, as we have said, rests only on the authority of the Chronicler, and is contradicted by the whole tenor of the story, as told in the book of Kings. If Josiah, indeed, had been 'partially acquainted' with the contents of such a Book, we may be sure that he would have taken care to make himself *fully* acquainted with it; and, in fact, Josiah was just the person, if ever king of Judah was, to have literally fulfilled the command laid down for every king in D. xvii. 18-20,—to copy out the Law with his own hand.

We believe that both king and people were 'partially acquainted by tradition' with the fact that a Law-Book once existed, and even with the *general* nature of its contents. But we see no signs of their being acquainted with the *details* of the present Pentateuch.

(xi) 'But, apart also from all these arguments, if we only consider the matter more seriously for a moment, as it appears when viewed in itself, the inadmissibility of the hypothesis, advanced by the opponents of the genuineness, is clearly exhibited. A Book, which penetrates so deeply into the whole life of the nation, impressing on it the most peculiar character,—which comes forward with the most direct opposition to an age sunken in idolatry, and unsparingly denounces war against it,—which is promulgated at a time when the Prophets, such even as Jeremiah, were exposed to the mockery of frivolous contemporaries, from whom neither Law nor Prophecy could expect any hearty recognition,—this book is said to make its appearance suddenly, being a deceptive fabrication of the Priests, announcing to the people their punishment, and producing the deepest impression upon them, without anyone raising the cry of deceit and falsehood, without a voice being raised against it, when it appears to have been the interest of all to detect and expose the falseness of the book, and the deception which had been practised with it! Yet there was nothing more simple and easy than the adduction of proof in such a case, which besides could not but reckon on the accordance and sympathy of numbers.'

Ans. (a) There was every reason to expect that, *at first*, the whole body of the people would be greatly affected by the discovery,—both because they had a general traditional knowledge of the existence of some such a book in former days, and because of the earnestness with which the king and leading men received it, as well as because of the solemn and impressive character of the language of the book itself,—especially, that part of it, Deuteronomy, which we believe to have been read in their hearing.

(β) But how do we know that no voice was raised against it,—if not immediately, in the first years of zeal, upon the new discovery, yet afterwards, at all events, when men's feelings began to cool, and they began to reconsider the matter? We have no record except from one, who may himself have been a party to the whole scheme,—who may, indeed, have been the chief person concerned.

(γ) We do not, in fact, find that even the thrilling language of this book made any great *permanent* impression on the people. There is no sign, as we have said, that the Passover was ever *kept again* with such solemnity, or that the Feast of Weeks and the Feast of Tabernacles,—respecting which the command is laid down so distinctly in E. xxiii. 14-17, xxxiv. 22-24, L. xxiii. 15-21, 33-35, D. xvi. 16, where we find it so strongly enjoined, 'Three times in a year shall all thy males appear before Jehovah thy God in the place which He shall choose, in the Feast of Unleavened Bread, and in the Feast of Weeks, and in the Feast of Tabernacles, and they shall not appear before Jehovah empty,'—were ever kept at all, even by Josiah.

(δ) It would seem also that not till the reign of Zedekiah, the son of Josiah, did 'the king and princes and all the people,'—probably at the instance of Jeremiah himself,—make a covenant to carry out the law in D. x. 12, for releasing their Hebrew servants, and this covenant they presently broke, Jer. xxxiv. 8-11. So, too, all the solemn threatenings of the Law did not prevent the children of Judah from 'remembering their altars and their groves by the green trees upon the high hills,' Jer. xvii. 2,—from loving and serving, walking after, seeking, worshipping, 'the sun and the moon and all the host of heaven,' Jer. viii. 2,—from 'having gods according to the number of their cities, and setting up altars, according to the number of the streets of Jerusalem, to that shameful thing, even to burn incense unto Baal,' Jer. xi. 13.

(xii) 'The copy found in the Temple was beyond dispute the Temple copy. It is quite an useless question, whether it was the autograph of Moses, or a later transcription instead of it; for even in the latter case it should be regarded as being as good as the autograph, with as much justice as if we should say that the Temple, when repaired by Josiah, still remained Solomon's Temple. . . . It is manifest how easily such a copy, unobserved, might remain, especially as it did not lie in the Ark itself, and be neglected,—how easily even, under Priests who, to please the Kings, favoured, rather than hindered, idolatrous practices, especially under Josiah's immediate predecessors, the obnoxious testimony of

Jehovah against His people might be intentionally put aside; as, on the other hand, it is manifest, that just such a copy as this must also have made a remarkable impression when it was found. The only thing, concerning which we are left in the dark by the history, that is specially occupied by the *sequel* of this occurrence, is the way and manner in which this copy had been lost. This circumstance, however, is so little essential, and may so easily and naturally be explained from the preceding accounts,—those of the practices of Manasseh, in particular,—that any unprejudiced writer might suitably enough pass it over. But on that account it is also inadmissible, to attempt to settle how long that copy had been missing or unknown; and the main point of the whole narrative must still be regarded as this, that a particularly remarkable copy of the ‘Book of the Law’ was found in the Temple, the discovery and reading of which produced an exceedingly beneficial impression on the king and the nation, because it was recognised by all as a sacred obligatory book and as the Mosaic Law.’

Ans. It is strange that for eighteen years of Josiah’s reign, (not to speak of the penitential years of Manasseh, which rest upon the very doubtful authority of the Chronicler,) the Temple copy should have lain in the Temple all the while, yet never have been found by Hilkiah till now. It is also very strange that the historian should not have given the least hint anywhere, that the Book now found was the identical Temple copy, which had been long mourned as lost.

CHAPTER VI.

DEUTERONOMY PROBABLY WRITTEN ABOUT THE TIME OF JOSIAH.

559. Thus there is nothing in the known facts of the case to negative the supposition, that the ‘Book of the Law’ was the Book of Deuteronomy, recently composed, and now for the first time produced, and read in the ears of the people,—except, of course, the moral difficulty which we find in attributing such a proceeding as this to *good men*, as Hilkiah and, perhaps, Jeremiah. But we must not judge of those times by our own; nor must we leave out of consideration the circumstances, which may have justified to their minds such an act as this. The deplorable condition of their people, sunk in the most debasing idolatries, might be thought to require some powerful influence to be brought upon them, beyond even an ordinary prophet’s voice.

560. Prophets, in fact, had already spoken,—Joel, Hosea, Amos, Isaiah, Micah; but their words had not availed to keep back the people from those

deadly sins, which had already brought down upon the Ten Tribes a fearful judgment, and threatened before long a yet more terrible woe upon Judah and Jerusalem. What if the authority of the great Lawgiver should be brought to bear upon them? And,—since the Law-Book, as it then existed, was not well suited for the present necessity,—with its long details of the lives of their forefathers, and of the events which attended the deliverance out of Egypt and the march through the wilderness, as well as its minute directions about artistic and ceremonial matters,—what if the very *spirit* of the older Law should be summed up in a powerful address, adapted to the present circumstances of the times—such as Moses *would have delivered*, if now present with his people—and be put into the mouth of the departing Lawgiver?

561. Let it be remembered that in the Book of Deuteronomy it is *Moses* always, and not Jehovah, who is introduced as speaking, except in xi.14,15, xxix.5,6, where the writer seems unconsciously to have passed from the person of Moses into that of Jehovah,—

‘I will give you the rain of your land in due season . . . and I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle.’ ‘And I have led you forty years in the wilderness . . . that ye might know that I am Jehovah your God.’

Otherwise, the writer is only ascribing to Moses himself such thoughts as he might naturally be supposed to have, when taking leave of his people.

And further, though it cannot be supposed, as we have said, that the old Law-Book was *read out at length* by the king in the ears of his people, yet it *may* have been only increased by the portion newly added to it. Thus, when the whole Book was found by Hilkiah, he might have been able to say with truth that he had found the ‘Book of the Law.’

562. There is also another point of view from which the matter should be regarded. Supposing (to fix our ideas) that Jeremiah really did write the book, we must not forget that he was a Prophet and, as such, habitually disposed to regard all the special impulses of his

mind to religious activity, as direct inspirations from the Divine Source of Truth. To us, with our inductive training and scientific habits of mind, the correct statement of *facts* appears of the first necessity; and consciously to misstate them, or to state as fact what we do not know or believe from *external* testimony to be fact, is a crime against Truth.

563. But to a man like Jeremiah, who believed himself to be in *immediate* communication with the Source of all Truth, this condition must have been reversed. The *inner* Voice, which he believed to be the Voice of the Divine Teacher, would become all powerful—would silence at once all doubts and questionings. What it ordered him to do, he would do without hesitation, as by direct command of God: and all considerations as to morality or immorality would either not be entertained at all, or would only take the form of misgivings as to whether, possibly, in any particular case, the command itself was really Divine.

564. Let us imagine, then, that Jeremiah, or any other contemporary Seer, meditating upon the condition of his country, and the means of weaning his people from idolatry, *became possessed with* the idea of writing to them an address, as in the name of Moses, of the kind which we have just been considering, in which the laws ascribed to him, and handed down from an earlier age, having become in many respects unsuitable, should be adapted anew to the circumstances of the present times, and re-enforced with solemn prophetic utterances. This thought, we may believe, would take in the Prophet's mind the form of a Divine command. All question of *deception* or *fraus pia* would vanish. And Huldah, too, in like manner, if she knew of what was being done, would consider, not whether it was right or wrong to speak to the Jews in the name of Moses, but what was surely about to happen, since these threats of coming judgment, thus spoken, were uttered by Divine Inspiration, and, therefore, were certainly true.

565. And this is very much what her words imply, if truly reported. She

makes *no reference to Moses*; she does not even refer, as Josiah is said to have done, to '*our fathers* not having *hearkened to the words of this book*, 2K.xxii.13. She says only, v.16,17:—

'Thus saith Jehovah, Behold, I will bring evil upon this place, and upon the inhabitants thereof, even all the words of the book which the king of Judah hath read, because they have forsaken me, and have burned incense unto other gods,' &c.

One might almost say that she *studiously avoids* asserting anything affirmatory of the notion that the book itself was an old book, the work of Moses, and confines herself to her prophetic function of declaring that the evil threatened would surely come to pass. And this is equally true if this part of the history was written, as some suppose, by Jeremiah, and these words are *his* words, expressing the *tenor*, rather than the actual language, of Huldah's reply.

566. Again, the effect upon the king's mind, and the consequent movement among the people, *may* have been far greater than had been even anticipated. It might have been intended merely to produce this new work, as a '*prophecy in disguise*,' in the hope that it might take some strong hold upon the national mind, and confirm the hands of those who were labouring to restore the true Faith in Judah. And, perhaps, at first, it was felt to be difficult or undesirable to say or do anything which might act as a check upon the zeal and energy which the king himself exhibited, and in which, as it seems, he was generally supported by the people, in putting down by force the gross idolatries which abounded in his kingdom.

567. That impulsive effort, in fact, which followed immediately the reading of the '*Book*,' might have been arrested, if Josiah had been told at once the true origin of those awful words, which had made so strong an impression on him. They were not less awful, indeed, or less true, because uttered in the name of Moses by such a Prophet as Jeremiah. But still it is obvious that their effect was likely to be greatly intensified under the idea that they were the last utterances of Moses himself. And, as we have

said, we seem to have an indication that the real facts of the case subsequently became known to the king, if not to the people generally, in the circumstance, that no such efforts appear to have been made afterwards in his reign to bring the people to Jerusalem at the other Great Feasts, even in that same year, and that no other Passover seems to have been kept with any such solemnity.

568. At any rate, we may consider that the following points have now been sufficiently established:—

(i) The Book of Deuteronomy must have been written chiefly by one writer;

(ii) This writer must have been a different person from the writer or writers, by whom the rest of the Pentateuch, speaking generally, was written;

(iii) The Deuteronomist, whoever he may have been, must have lived in a later age than either the Elohist or Jehovist, since he takes for granted facts recorded in their narrative;

(iv) There are some indications of this book having been written in a *very late* age of the Hebrew history;

(v) There are historical circumstances, which suggest that it may have been composed in the early part of Josiah's reign;

(vi) There is a remarkable correspondence between the peculiar expressions of the Deuteronomist and the language of *Jeremiah*, who did live in that age.

(vii) The Deuteronomist must have been either *Jeremiah* himself, or some other great Prophet of the later times of the Jewish Monarchy, whose language was closely allied to that of *Jeremiah*.

CHAPTER VII.

DEUT. I. 1-II. 37.

569. We shall next proceed to show that this Book contains also many other very distinct signs of such a later origin, in the existence of numerous *contradictions* to the older narrative, such as might naturally be expected to arise under these circumstances, when

a later writer was adding freely from his own mind, and from his own point of view, to writings of an older time, and was not careful to preserve strictly the unity of the different parts of the story. This implies, however, that he did not regard the older document as so inexpressibly sacred and so infallibly Divine, as is implied in modern popular views of inspiration.

570. In order to set these contradictions plainly before the reader, it will be desirable to pass under review the whole Book of Deuteronomy, taking notice only of those passages, which affect in any way the questions now under consideration, and carefully watching for any *signs of time*, which may betray themselves in the writer's expressions. We may assume that we now know that he lived in a *later* day than the other writers of the Pentateuch. But we are further seeking to ascertain, if possible, from the internal evidence of the book itself, in *what* later day he lived. We shall prefix an asterisk (*) to those passages, which appear most important in this last respect, as involving 'signs of time.'

571. D. i. 1.

'These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel on the other [E.V. this] side Jordan, in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Zuph, between Paran, and Tophel, and Laban, and Hazeroth, and Dizahab.'

The above words are, of course, perfectly intelligible, if we are not obliged to believe that the Book of Deuteronomy is historically true, or, rather, if we are allowed to suppose (what is, doubtless, the true state of the case) that it is merely the product of a devout writer's imagination,—a poem, in short, in which he puts such words into the mouth of Moses as he deemed appropriate to the occasion. The writer, in such a case, would not have realised to himself the full meaning of his own words,—'*Moses spake unto all Israel.*'

572. Doubtless, the expression 'all Israel' may *sometimes* be used for the 'elders,' &c. by whom an order might be communicated to the whole host. But, that it means certainly in this passage the assembled host, and is *intended* to mean it, (and not the 'elders')

or 'headmen' only, as some have suggested), if the narrative is to be regarded as literally and historically true, cannot, as it appears to me, be reasonably denied. And surely the words in D.xxix.12, 11, are enough to decide the question:—

'Ye stand this day all of you before Jehovah your God,—your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, all the men of Israel,—your little ones, your wives, and the stranger that is in thy camp, from the heaver of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water.'

573. The writer, however, I repeat, was not guilty of any such absurdity as the words, understood in their natural and proper meaning, would imply. For he never realised to himself the thing stated as an historical fact, any more than TACITUS would have imagined that the words, which he has put into the mouth of the barbarian chief, Gaius, would be supposed by any intelligent reader to have been actually uttered by him. SCOTT, of course, takes the literal view of the matter, and explains it as follows:—

'The words,' as here mentioned, seem to mean the subsequent exhortations, which Moses delivered to the principal persons in Israel, that they might make them known in their several tribes and families. Perhaps he spake some of the principal passages many times over to the people in general, assembled in large companies for that purpose. But there is no ground to suppose that his voice was *miraculously* rendered audible to the whole nation at once, as some have asserted.

574. KNOBEL observes, *Deut. p. 207*:—

It is not easy to perceive for what reason the author has denoted this locality in an extraordinary and unnecessary way with *six names*, especially as it has been so often named already, N.xxii.1, xxvi.3, 63, xxxi.12, xxxiii.48, 49, 50, xxxv.1, xxxvi.13, and must have been well known to the reader.

This circumstance is most naturally to be accounted for by the fact of a later—rather, a *much* later—writer wishing to define more accurately in his own age a locality, which he found distinguished so remarkably in the older records,—especially as it lay within reach, as it were, of everyone who cared to see it, not far away in the Arabian waste, and he designed to take it as the scene of the farewell addresses of Moses. And this is confirmed by his adding in a parenthesis,—

'There are eleven days' journey from Horeb

by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-Barnea,' v.2,—

words, which surely could never have been inserted in this way by Moses or any *contemporary* writer.

575. D.i.6–18.

The account of the appointment of officers, as here given, involves more than one inconsistency. First, the Deuteronomist loses sight of the fact that, according to the story, N.xxvi.64, the whole generation was *dead* which received the Law at Horeb; and so he makes Moses say, v.6, 'Jehovah our God spake unto *us* in Horeb,' and still more distinctly, v.9, 'I spake unto *you* at that time, saying, I am not able to bear you myself alone,' and v.14, 'Ye answered me, and said.'

576. But a more remarkable discrepancy exists in v.15, where the statement is wholly at variance with that in E.xviii.25, 26. In this latter passage, the appointment of the officers takes place *before* the giving of the Law at Sinai; here it takes place nearly twelve months afterwards, when they are *just about to leave* Horeb, v.6. If it be said that we must extend the meaning of the phrase 'at that time' in v.9, 18, to include the whole twelve months, and must suppose that the fact stated in v.6–8 occurred at a point of time subsequently to that in v.9–18, yet both these accounts are contradictory to that in N.xi.14–17. For here, *after they have left Horeb*, Moses complains of the burden of the people, (though, according to either of the other two statements, he had a multitude of officers to help him,) and he is commanded then to appoint seventy elders,—

'and they shall bear the burden of the people with thee, that thou bear it not thyself alone.'

577. SCOTT attempts to reconcile the difficulty as follows:—

The counsel, here referred to, seems to have been suggested by Jethro *before* the giving of the Law. Moses, in consequence, proposed it to the Lord, who approved it, and then with the concurrence of the people it at length took place, about the time when they departed from Horeb, and at no great distance from that of the appointment of the seventy elders.

That is to say, according to SCOTT, though Moses was 'wearing away'

with the labour of judging the people, he delayed twelve months to carry out his father-in-law's advice! But the words in E. xviii. 24, 25, plainly imply that he acted at once on Jethro's advice; and they state also that '*Moses chose able men out of all Israel*' for these offices, v. 25, whereas in D. i. 13 we read—'*Take you wise men, and understanding, and known among your tribes, and I will make them rulers over you.*'

578. D. i. 22, 23.

'*And ye came near unto me, every one of you, and said, We will send men before us, and they shall search us out the land, and bring us word again by what way we must go up, and into what cities we shall come. And the saying pleased me well; and I took twelve men of you, one of a tribe, &c.*'

But in N. xiii. 1, 2, the sending of the spies is ascribed, not to a suggestion from the people, but to an express command of Almighty God:—

'*And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Send thou men, that they may search the land of Canaan, which I give unto the children of Israel; of every tribe of their fathers shall ye send a man, every one a ruler among them.*'

Scott says on this point:—

We find elsewhere that the people first proposed to Moses this design of searching the land, who, not suspecting the distrust and unbelief which had suggested it, approved the proposal and asked counsel of the Lord. He, having been provoked by their former rebellions, permitted it, and gave directions accordingly, in order to a further discovery of their wickedness, the display of His own glory, and for the instruction of His Church in all ages.

579. But here again the writer seems to have forgotten that these things took place, according to the story, forty years before, when most of those, whom he was now addressing, were not even born, and none of them, except Caleb and Joshua, were of age to be numbered. Yet he makes Moses say, '*Ye came near unto me, every one of you, &c.,*' v. 22, and the spies '*brought us word again,*' v. 25, and '*ye would not go up,*' v. 26, and '*ye murmured in your tents,*' v. 27. So we have in v. 29, '*Then I said unto you, Dread not, neither be afraid of them,*' and v. 32, '*Yet in this thing ye did not believe Jehovah your God,*'—with many more like instances, '*and ye came near, and stood under the mountain, and Jehovah spake unto you out of the midst of the fire; ye heard the voice of the*

words, but saw no similitude; only ye heard a voice,' iv. 11, 12.

See also the passages quoted in (604).

Again, in D. i. 21, Moses is made to exhort the people to '*go up and possess the land,*' before sending the spies; whereas the whole account in N. xiii implies, though it does not exactly state, the contrary.

580. D. i. 37-40.

'*Also Jehovah was angry with me for your sakes, saying, Thou also shalt not go in thither. But Joshua, the son of Nun, which standeth before thee, he shall go in thither; encourage him, for he shall cause Israel to inherit it. Moreover, your little ones, which ye said should be a prey, and your children which in that day had no knowledge between good and evil, they shall go in thither, and unto them will I give it, and they shall possess it. But as for you, turn you, and take your journey into the wilderness by the way of the Red Sea.*'

Here, again, the Deuteronomist, though thoroughly imbued with a general notion of the story, seems to have lost sight of the particular fact that Moses was sentenced to die, and Joshua appointed to succeed him, not at the time which is here referred to, in the days of the former generation, but after an interval of thirty-seven years, at the end of the wanderings, N. xxvii. 15-23, only just before this address is supposed to be delivered.

581. It should be noticed also that three times in Deuteronomy, viz. i. 37, iii. 26, iv. 21, it is stated that Jehovah '*was angry*' with Moses on account of the perverse behaviour of the people. Whereas, in N. xx. 12, xxvii. 12-14, God's displeasure is ascribed to the unbelief or the impatience of Moses himself. If this discourse in Deuteronomy had really been delivered by Moses it would be strange that he should omit to make any reference whatever to the fact of his own misconduct, and should throw all the blame here upon the people.

*582. D. ii. 4, 5.

'*And command thou the people, saying, Ye are to pass through the coast of your brethren the children of Esau, which dwell in Seir; and they shall be afraid of you. Take ye good heed unto yourselves therefore; meddle not with them; for I will not give you of their land, no, not so much as a foot-breadth; because I have given Mount Seir unto Esau for a possession.*'

We have here, most probably, an indication of *later time*, when the Deuteronomist lived, and when Edom was independent, and there was no likelihood of its being subject again to the yoke of Israel. We read, 1K.ix. 26—

'And king Solomon made a navy of ships in Ezion-geber, which is beside *Eloth*, [or *Elath*, D.ii.8.] on the shore of the Red Sea, in the land of *Edom*.'

But the possession of Elath was lost for a time, and recovered at last by Uzziah, who 'built Elath, and restored it to Judah,' 2K.xiv.22.

583. In the days of his grandson, Ahaz, however, it was lost permanently; for we read, 2K.xvi.6—

'At that time Rezin, king of Syria, recovered *Elath* to Syria, and drove the Jews from Elath; and the Syrians came to Elath, and dwelt there *unto this day*.'

From that time the Edomites appear to have maintained completely their independence as regards Judah. In Jeremiah's time this was the case, as we gather from Jer.ix. 26, xxv. 21, xxvii. 3, where Edom is reckoned as on a par with Egypt, Judah, Ammon, Moab, &c., and in Jer.xlix. 16 is threatened with punishment for its pride:—

'Thy terriblest hath deceived thee, and the pride of thine heart, O thou that dwellest in the clefts of the rock, that holdest the height of the hill; though thou shouldst make thy nest as high as the eagle, I will bring thee down from thence, saith Jehovah.'

584. D.ii.9.

'And Jehovah said unto me, Distress not the Moabites, neither contend with them in battle; for I will not give thee of their land for a possession; because I have given Ar unto the children of Lot for a possession.'

Here also we have most probably an indication of the long and flourishing independence of the Moabites in the time of the Deuteronomist.

'Moab hath been at ease from his youth, and he hath settled on his lees, and hath not been emptied from vessel to vessel, neither hath he gone into captivity; therefore his taste remaineth in him, and his scent is not changed.' Jer. xlviii. 11.

'We have heard the pride of Moab, (he is exceeding proud,) his loftiness, and his arrogance, and his pride, and the haughtiness of his heart.' Jer. xlviii. 29.

*585. D.ii.12.

'As Israel *did* unto the land of his possession, which Jehovah gave unto them.'

We have already pointed out (253) that the above language indicates that the writer was living *after* the Conquest of the land of Canaan. The expression, 'land of his (Israel's) possession,' can denote nothing else than the identical Palestine, and though it might *include* the trans-Jordanic land, could not have been used to denote that alone.

586. D.ii.19.

'When thou comest nigh over against the children of Ammon, distress them not, nor meddle with them; for I will not give thee of the land of the children of Ammon any possession; because I have given it unto the children of Lot for a possession.'

We read of the Ammonites Jer.xlix. 1, 4:—

'Concerning the Ammonites, thus saith Jehovah: Hath Israel no sons? hath he no heir? Why then doth their king inherit Gad, and his people dwell in his cities? . . . Wherefore gloriest thou in the valleys, thy flowing valley, O backsliding daughter,—that trusted in her treasures, saying, Who shall come unto me?'

And in Jer.xl. 14 mention is made of 'Baalis, king of the Ammonites.' Thus it appears that these also were independent in Jeremiah's days.

587. D.ii.9—12, 19—23.

We have already noticed (262) that the introduction of these archaeological notices about the 'Emim,' 'Horim,' and 'Zamzummim,' who in ancient days inhabited the countries subsequently occupied by Moab, Edom, and Ammon, as also about the 'Avim,' who were expelled by the 'Caphtorim,' betrays the hand of a later writer, who took an interest in recording such facts as these, which implied that these nations, akin to Israel, had, like Israel, been favoured with special help and guidance from above, and put in possession of the lands of other occupants, whom Jehovah 'destroyed before them.'

588. D.ii.29.

The statement, which is here made, viz. that the Edomites and Moabites sold meat and water to the Israelites, is at variance with those in N.xx. 18, 20, 21, and, as regards Moab, also to D.xxiii. 3, 4. So we read in Ju.xi. 17—

'Then Israel sent messengers unto the king of Edom, saying, Let me, I pray thee, pass through thy land; but the king of Edom

would not hearken thereto. And in like manner they sent unto the king of Moab; but he would not consent.'

589. KURTZ remarks, iii. p. 332:—

On the western side the mountains of Edom rise abruptly from the Arabah. There are only a few passes, which are at all accessible from this side, and these can easily be occupied. But, on the east, the mountains slope gently off into a desert tract of table-land, which is still a hundred feet higher, at least, than the desert of El Tih. On this side, therefore, the land was open; and they were not very likely to assume a hostile attitude towards the 600,000 fighting men of Israel. And the very fact that they had offended the Israelites, by opposing them on the western border, would make them more eager to avoid everything that could give occasion for anger or revenge, now that they had come round to the eastern side.

590. But this does not dispose of the difficulty; for in D.xxiii.3,4, we read—

'An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of Jehovah, because they met you not with bread and with water in the way, when ye came out from Egypt, and because they hired against thee Balaam, the son of Beor, to curse thee.'

KURTZ and HENGSTENBERG say that D.ii.29 refers to a request to *sell* bread and water to the Israelites, which the Moabites did, but not out of any kindness,—they did it only 'as a manifestation of their selfish and grasping disposition'; whereas in D.xxiii.4 the charge made against them is that they did not come forward of *their own accord* to greet their brethren, the Israelites, and 'meet them' on the way with presents of food. But, whatever *Edom* may have done in the way of kindness, (of which, however, there is no indication in the book of Numbers,) there is not the least sign in the older story that Balak, king of *Moab*, and his people, supplied the Israelites with bread and water at all, whether for love or for money.

CHAPTER VIII.

DEUT. III. 1-IX. 29.

591. D.iii.11,14.

We have considered already (255) the story of Og's 'iron bedstead' referred to in v.11, and (244) the expression 'unto this day' in v.14, as being signs of this Book having been composed at a later date than the age of the Exodus. It is very probable that Og's 'bed' was really a large sarcophagus, made of the

dark basalt which abounds in the district of Bashan. Many of these stone coffins still exist in these regions, and are used as water-troughs by the inhabitants.

592. For an interesting account of the ruined cities of Bashan, described in v.4,5, as 'threescore cities, all fenced with high walls, gates, and bars,'—which now remain, 'crowded together' in the country S.E. of Damascus, called the Haurān,—

of great size, of very high antiquity, and in a high state of preservation,—not mere sites, in many cases not even ruins, but still standing almost uninjured, the streets perfect, the houses perfect, the walls perfect, the stone doors still hanging on their hinges—

see papers by C. C. GRAHAM, Esq. in the *Journal of the Geog. Soc.* for 1858 and *Cambridge Essays* for 1858.

Doubtless these massive Cyclopean ruins existed in the time of the Deuteronomist, as they do now, and as they probably existed for ages before him.

593. D.iii.29.

'So we abode in the valley over against Bethpeor.'

Here we have, as KNOBEL says, p.223—

An accurate note of place, which the author has made for his readers, not Moses for his Israelites.

This will be evident, when it is considered that, according to the story (162), the facts related in this chapter—to which the phrase 'at that time' is repeatedly applied—had only just occurred, a few days before, and that they were actually now 'abiding in the valley over against Bethpeor,' according to the notice in iv.46.

594. D.iv.3,4.

'Your eyes have seen what Jehovah did because of Baal-Peor; for all the men that followed Baal-Peor, Jehovah thy God hath destroyed them from among you. But ye, that did cleave unto Jehovah your God, are alive every one of you this day.'

Dean GRAVES remarks, i. p. 137, 138:—

The legislator, in order to deter the Jews from idolatry, alludes to this fact. But he notices no circumstance but one which, though in the original narrative not stated, was infinitely the most important to advert to on this occasion, but which no persons but spectators of the fact, and perfectly acquainted with every individual concerned in it, could possibly feel the truth of.

Upon such frail foundations are based many of the much-commended arguments of our standard books on the authenticity and historical veracity of the Pentateuch! It is obvious that the whole question at issue is begged in the first instance, when it is taken for granted as a fact, that Moses actually did deliver this address.

*595. D. iv. 19.

'And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the Sun and the Moon and the Stars, and all the Host of Heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them, &c.'

The 'Sun' seems to have been an object of worship in early days among the tribes of Canaan, as is implied by the fact that, the name of the town *Beth-shemesh* means 'House of the Sun,' corresponding to *Beth-el*, 'House of God.' Probably, the Sun was worshipped under the name *Baal* or *Adon*, = 'Lord,' *Jao*, &c. (see Part II, p. 159, 160,) and the Moon under that of 'Astarte.'

596. But the worship of the 'Host of Heaven' is first named in the history, as one of the sins for which the Ten Tribes were carried captive, in 2K. xvii. 16; and it seems to have been first generally practised in *Judah* in the reign of *Manasseh*, the father of *Josiah*, 2K. xxi. 3, 5, 2Ch. xxxiii. 3, and is explained by KNOBEL, *Deut. p. 226*, to have arisen out of Assyrian and Chaldee influences. *Manasseh's* grandfather *Ahaz* may, indeed, have introduced it, as appears from a comparison of 2K. xxiii. 12, where we read of—

'the altars that were on the top of the upper chamber of *Ahaz*,'—
with Jer. xix. 13,—

'the houses upon whose roofs they have burnt incense unto all the Host of Heaven.'

597. But it is not mentioned among the special offences of king *Ahaz* in 2K. xvi. 3, 4, and, therefore, if introduced in that reign, probably was not much practised, and it was certainly not adopted by his son *Hezekiah*. In *Manasseh's* reign, however, it seems to have flourished. Hence we find express mention made of this worship in the story of *Josiah's* reformation, 2K. xxiii, where we read of the vessels that were made 'for all the Host of Heaven,' v. 4, the Priests that burned incense 'to the Sun and to the Moon and to the

Planets and to all the Host of Heaven,' v. 5, 'the chariots of the Sun,' v. 11.

598. Though put down by *Josiah* so strongly, it appears, however, to have revived again, since we find in this very reign *Zephaniah* prophesying the destruction of 'them that worship the Host of Heaven upon the housetops, i. 5. And *Jeremiah* says,—

'Seest thou not what they do in the cities of *Judah* and in the streets of *Jerusalem*? The children gather wood, and the fathers kindle the fire, and the women knead their dough, to make cakes to the Queen of Heaven,' &c., vii. 17, 18;—

'And they shall spread them before the Sun and the Moon and all the Host of Heaven, whom they have loved, and whom they have served, and after whom they have walked, and whom they have sought, and whom they have worshipped,' &c., viii. 2;—

'And the houses of *Jerusalem*, and the houses of the kings of *Judah*, shall be defiled as the place of *Tophet*, because of all the houses upon whose roofs they have burned incense unto all the Host of Heaven,' &c., xix. 13.

And see Jer. xlv. 17-19, 25, Ez. viii. 16.

599. We may observe a strong indication, of the Book of Deuteronomy having been written in a later age than the other four Books (generally) of the Pentateuch, in the fact that this worship is not mentioned in any part of the Pentateuch, except D. iv. 19, xvii. 3. So, too, *complete phrases*, similar to this, 'the Sun and the Moon and all the Host of Heaven,' occur only in D. iv. 19, xvii. 3, Jer. viii. 2, and 2K. xxiii. 5, which may have been written by *Jeremiah* himself (557, v).

*600. D. iv. 25-28.

'When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have remained long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves. . . . I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over *Jordan* to possess it. . . . And *Jehovah* shall scatter you among the nations, and ye shall be left few in number among the heathen, whither *Jehovah* shall lead you. And there ye shall serve gods, the work of men's hands, wood and stone, which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor smell.'

Assuming that these words were not spoken by *Moses* prophetically, with a view to future events, they seem to imply that the writer had before him the captivity of the Ten Tribes, and wished to preserve *Judah* from the same judgment.

601. D. iv. 29-31.

'But, if from thence thou shalt seek Jehovah thy God, thou shalt find Him, if thou seek him with all thy heart and with all thy soul. When thou art in tribulation, and all these things are come upon thee, in the latter days, if thou turn to Jehovah thy God, and shalt be obedient unto His Voice,—for Jehovah thy God is a merciful God,—He will not forsake thee, neither destroy thee, nor forget the covenant of thy fathers which He swore unto them.'

Here also the Deuteronomist evidently contemplates the possibility of the Ten Tribes being restored from their captivity, and reinstated in their own land, if only they would repent and return to Jehovah their God. His hope was, doubtless, that the tribes of Israel would all be gathered again one day under the government of the House of David. We shall see other similar indications of these warm, patriotic expectations of brighter days for Israel.

*602. D. iv. 38.

'To drive out nations from before thee greater and mightier than thou art, to bring thee in, to give thee their land for an inheritance, as it is this day.'

We have here another indication that the writer was living in an age after the Conquest; though the proof is not so decisive as that in (585), since it might be argued that the above language is sufficiently explained by reference to the Conquest of the trans-Jordanic lands, which had already taken place.

603. D. iv. 41-49.

This section, as it now stands, is rather perplexing, and may, perhaps, contain a fragment of the older document, removed from its proper place in connexion with the narrative in N. xxxv.* In its present position, it interrupts very awkwardly

* If this be, as we suppose, a passage of mixed origin,—that is, a fragment of the older document, retouched by the Deuteronomist,—yet it is still difficult, if not impossible, to separate the different portions which are due to different authors.

In v. 44, however, the expression, 'the Law,' savours strongly of the Deuteronomist (517); while v. 45 is certainly Deuteronomistic. The multiplication in this verse of synonymous terms, 'the testimonies, and the statutes, and the judgments,' is very common in Deuteronomy, e.g. iv. 1, 5, 8, 14, 40, v. 31, vi. 1, 17, 20, &c., and the plural *hedoth*, is used, as here, in the sense of 'precepts,' or 'ordinances,' in D. iv. 45, vi. 17, 20, but nowhere else in the Pentateuch.

the address of Moses, or, rather, it is inserted abruptly between two separate addresses, which have no connexion either with it or with each other, for D. v. 1 begins very abruptly.

604. D. v. 2-5.

'Jehovah our God made a covenant with us at Horeb. Jehovah made not this covenant with our fathers, but with us, even us, who are all of us here alive this day. Jehovah talked with you face to face in the mount out of the midst of the fire. I stood between Jehovah and you at that time, to show you the word of Jehovah; for ye were afraid by reason of the fire, and went not up unto the mount.'

Here we have very strong instances of the oversight referred to in (579). It may, of course, be said that Moses, in all these cases, is addressing the people collectively, and that the fathers, with whom the covenant was made at Horeb, included the children to whom he was now speaking at the end of the wanderings. But, if every one of those fathers was dead, as the narrative tells us, and only a small proportion of those now listening to Moses was present on the former occasion, as children under age, the above words could scarcely have been used by one taking note of this circumstance. Comp. also xi. 2-7:—

'I speak not with your children, which have not known His miracles and His acts, which He did in the midst of Egypt, unto Pharaoh the king of Egypt, and unto all his land, &c.; but your eyes have seen all the great acts of Jehovah which He did.'

605. D. v. 6-21.

That the later Deuteronomist had no very strong sense of the unspeakable sacredness of the earlier document, is sufficiently plain by the liberties he has taken with its contents, in altering several of its expressions, and, in particular, modifying in a remarkable manner, the Fourth Commandment. One would have thought that anyone—even Moses himself—while repeating words believed to be ineffably holy,—which had not only been uttered in the ears of all Israel by Jehovah Himself, but had been written down by the Finger of God, twice over, on the Tables of stone,—would not have varied by a single letter from the Divine original.

606. Yet how stands the case in this respect? In the Hebrew there are

several minor discrepancies, such as changes or additions of words, some of which may be observed in the English translation. Thus we may note the insertions, 'as Jehovah your God has commanded thee,' v.12,16, 'nor thine ox, nor thine ass,' v.14, 'that it may go well with thee,' v.16, 'his field,' v.21, and the inversion of the order of the clauses in v.21. This last, indeed, completely changes the original meaning of the word 'house': for in E.xx.17 it denotes the house and all that belongs to it, so that v.17 sums up the different parts of the 'house,' whereas in D.v.21, the word denotes merely 'dwelling.'

607. But the latter part of the Fourth Commandment is completely altered, and a totally different reason is assigned, in the passage of Deuteronomy, for sanctifying the Sabbath, from that laid down in the book of Exodus, and, what is still more remarkable, without any reference to the latter reason as even existing.

E.xx.8-11.

Remember the Sabbath Day to hallow it. Six days shalt thou labour and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jehovah thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: for in six days Jehovah made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day; WHEREFORE Jehovah blessed the Sabbath Day and hallowed it.

D.v.12-15.

Keep the Sabbath Day to hallow it, as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee. Six days shalt thou labour, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the Sabbath of Jehovah thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, nor thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thine ox, nor thine ass, nor any of thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates: that thy man-servant and thy maid-servant may rest as well as thou. And remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and that Jehovah, thy God, brought thee out thence, through a mighty hand, and by a stretched-out arm; WHEREFORE Jehovah thy God commanded thee to make (=keep) the Sabbath Day.

608. Upon the above we may remark as follows.

(i) Each writer distinctly *professes* to give the identical words *which were*

spoken by Jehovah Himself, at the very same point of time.

'God spake all these words, saying, &c.' E.xx.1.

'Jehovah talked with you, face to face, in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire . . . saying, &c.' D.v.4,5.

These words Jehovah spake unto all your assembly in the Mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice, and He added no more. And He wrote them in two Tables of stone, and delivered them unto me.' v.22.

(ii) This excludes the notion that one passage gives a mere *reminiscence* of the other, which might be defective, or might vary in some points, without materially affecting the general credibility of the narrative.

(iii) Hence the two statements involve an absolute contradiction.

(iv) Independently of the above contradiction, the variation here observed is so remarkable that it cannot be supposed that *Moses* wrote the passage in Deuteronomy, either forgetting, or designedly modifying, the words of the original commandment, which he had received in so solemn and wonderful a manner.

(v) The variation, therefore, between these two passages, is enough to show that the book of Deuteronomy, at all events, could not have been written by *Moses*.

(vi) From the agreement between the two passages there can be no doubt that the later Deuteronomist had before him the passage in Exodus.

(vii) As the Deuteronomist ventured to make so important a change in this Commandment, it is plain that he did not think it a sacrilegious act to alter the original form of the command,—that, in short, he regarded it as merely a *human* composition, emanating from some writer of a previous age.

609. D.viii.4.

'Thy raiment waxed not old upon thee, neither did thy foot swell, these forty years.'

So, too, we read in xxix.5:—

'Your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot.'

No mention is made of this miraculous provision of clothing in the older narrative. KURTZ observes, iii.312,313:

The history of the exposition of these verses furnishes one of the most striking examples

of the extent to which a merely literal exegesis of the Scriptures may go astray. A whole series of both Jewish and Christian commentators interpret these passages, without the least hesitation, as meaning that the clothes and shoes of the Israelitish children grew with their growth, and remained for the whole of the forty years not in the least the worse for wear. Thus JUSTIN says (*Dial. c. Tryph. c. 131*), 'The strings of whose sandals never broke; nor did the sandals themselves get old, nor their clothes wear out: but those of the children grew with their growth.' So PFEIFFER, 'By a remarkable miracle, not only did the clothes of the Israelites in the desert never get old, but they grew with the growth of the Israelites themselves, so as to fit both boys and men in succession.' PFEIFFER also quotes a Rabbinical saying with approbation: 'Go, and learn from the snail, whose shell grows with its body.' Other Rabbins suppose the angels of God to have acted as tailors to the Israelites, while they were in the desert, and interpret Ez.xvi.10-13 as containing a literal allusion to the fact. Without going to such an absurd length as this, AUGUSTINE, CHRYSOSTOM, THEODORET, GROTIUS, and even DEYLING, abide by the literal explanation, that, through the blessing of God, the clothes and shoes never wore out; so that those, who grew to manhood, were able to hand them over, as good as new, to the rising generation. By thus assuming a succession of wearers, these commentators, at all events, escaped the fatal notion that the clothes and shoes grew with the bodies of the wearers. When first PEYRERIUS denied that the clothes and shoes of the Israelites were miraculously preserved for forty years, and maintained that the meaning of the Mosaic account was nothing more than this, that the Jews were never in want of anything, during the whole of the forty years that they were in the desert, but had so abundant a supply of everything, especially of wool from their flocks, of cloth, of skins, and of leather, that they never were without materials from which to make their clothes,'—DEYLING, who is usually so very temperate, protested most vehemently against such '*petulantia et impietas*.' Nevertheless, the opinion expressed by PEYRERIUS became gradually the prevailing one. We find it advocated, for example, by CLEMENS, BUDDEUS, and LILIENTHAL. The last of the three, however, thinks it necessary to point, not only to the flocks possessed by the Israelites, from which they could obtain both wool and leather in great abundance, but also to the fact, that every Israelite must certainly have brought some clothes and shoes with him out of Egypt,—that they asked the Egyptians for clothes, and obtained them (E.iii.22, xii.35),—that they would, no doubt, take off the clothes of the Egyptians, who were drowned in the Red Sea, and afterwards washed on shore (E.xiv.30), and, lastly, that they took the booty of the conquered Amalekites, including, according to Josephus, a quantity of clothes.

610. But, surely, the literal interpretation of the texts in question is

the true one, and plainly implies a miracle of some kind, which prevented their clothes and shoes from wearing out, whatever may be the difficulty of conceiving what kind of miracle it could possibly have been.

611. D.viii.9.

'A land whose stones are *iron*, and out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass.'

We may notice, in passing, the familiar mention of 'iron' in this and other places of Deuteronomy, as where the writer speaks of the 'iron furnace,' iv.20, and iron tools, xix.5, xxviii.23, 48, in the (supposed) age of Moses, preceding that of Homer by about five centuries.

612. D.ix.3.

'So shalt thou drive them out, and destroy them quickly, as Jehovah hath said unto thee.'

KNOBEL observes here, p.244:—

In the ardour of the discourse, the writer forgets that he has just forbidden this destroying them 'quickly' in vii.22.

613. D.ix.18.

'I fell down before Jehovah *as at the first*, forty days and forty nights: I did neither eat bread nor drink water.'

Nothing is said in E.xxiv.18 of Moses 'fasting' on the *first* occasion of his spending 'forty days and forty nights' on the mount. But this the Deuteronomist has very naturally assumed, from the fact being recorded of his fasting thus on the *second* occasion, E.xxxiv.28.

614. According to the older story, however, he fasted these forty days and nights, *after* he had obeyed the command, 'Hew thee two tables of stone like unto the first,' &c., and had gone up into the mount the second time, E.xxxiv.1,2,28. Whereas the Deuteronomist, x.1, represents this very command to have been issued *after* the forty days' fasting of Moses, and as a gracious answer to it.

CHAPTER IX.

DEUT.X.1-XI.32.

615. D.x.1-5.

Great discrepancy exists between the narrative here and that in the Book of Exodus. It will be observed that in E.xxxiv.29 the two stone-tables with

the Ten Commandments are in the hands of Moses, before any receptacle has been made in which to place them. *Here*, however, the Ark is commanded to be made, *v.1*, and is actually made, *v.3*, *at the same time* with the second set of tables, *before* Moses goes up into the Mount to receive them. But the account in Exodus makes this impossible. Not only is there nothing said about the Ark in E.xxxiv.1, where he is commanded to make the tables; but it is only after coming down with the second set of tables that Moses, E.xxxv. 10-12, summons the 'wise-hearted' to—
'come and make all that Jehovah hath commanded, the Tabernacle, and his tent, and his covering, &c., the Ark and the staves thereof with the Mercy-seat, &c. ;'

and afterwards, in E.xxxvii.1-9, we have the full account of Bezaleel making it. And yet the Ark of the Deuteronomist was not, as might be suggested, a mere temporary Ark; for he makes Moses say, *v.5*:—

'I turned myself, and came down from the Mount, and put the tables into the Ark which I had made, and there they be, as Jehovah commanded me.'

616. Upon this point SCOTT says:—

'Probably, before Moses ascended the Mount the second time, he gave express orders to Bezaleel to get the Ark ready against he came down; and, having directed and ordered the making of it, he speaks as if he had made it; as Solomon is said to have builded the Temple, which he caused to be builded by the hands of others.'

Ans. Of course, there is no difficulty in supposing that, what Moses ordered to be made, he may be said to have made himself. The difficulty is that, according to the story in Exodus, the orders were plainly given, xxxv. 10, and executed, xxxvii.1-9, after Moses came down from the Mount with the second set of tables, which involves a direct contradiction to the account in Deuteronomy.

'Some, however, think that Moses prepared the Ark himself, as made of shittim-wood, and carried it up with the tables into the mount, and that Bezaleel afterwards covered it with gold.'

Ans. But the text of E.xxxvii.1,2, will not allow of this—'Bezaleel made the Ark of shittim-wood: two cubits and a half was the length of it, and a cubit and a half the breadth of it, and a cubit and a half the height of it. And he overlaid it with pure gold within and without, &c.'

617. But may we not have here also a sign of time? We have already noticed the fact (523.xiv) that the *Tabernacle*, which is so constantly men-

tioned in the middle three Books of the Pentateuch, is never once named by the Deuteronomist. May not this, perhaps, have arisen from the fact that he was living in a later age, when David's *Tabernacle* had long passed away out of the sight and memory of men, and the writer, consequently, did not recognise its existence to himself so vividly, as he did that of the *Ark*, which he mentions in x.1,2,3,5,8, xxxi. 9,25,26, and which was actually present, in his own days, in the Holy Place of the Temple? On the other hand, the earlier writer, living, as we suppose, in the later days of David, or the beginning of Solomon's reign, would have had the Tabernacle on Mount Zion before him, as his help in realising the idea of the Tent in the wilderness.

618. D.x.6,7.

'And the children of Israel took their journey from Beeroth of the children of Jaakan to Mosera. There Aaron died, and there he was buried; and Eleazar his son ministered in the Priest's office in his stead. From thence they journeyed unto Gudgodah, and from Gudgodah to Jotbath, a land of rivers of waters.'

This passage is evidently quite out of its place, and, as here introduced, it involves a complete contradiction. For the death of Aaron is here described as happening *before* the separation of the Levites, *v.8,9*,—

'at that time Jehovah separated the tribe of Levi, &c.,'

which took place, according to the older story, in his life-time, N.iii.5,6. Nor can the difficulty be relieved by understanding the expression 'at that time' in a general sense, as equivalent to 'about that time;' for the death of Aaron took place in the *fortieth* year of the wanderings, N.xxxiii.38, and the separation of the Levites in the *second*, N.i.1.

619. It is probable that D.x.6,7, is a fragment of the older record, inserted here, out of its proper place, by the Deuteronomist.

SCOTT observes:—

These verses so break in upon the connection of Moses's discourse, that they perplex commentators. *It is evident that Moses did not much regard exactness of method in his discourse.*

620. D.x.8,9.

'At that time Jehovah separated the *tribe of Levi*, to bear the Ark of the Covenant of Jehovah, to stand before Jehovah to minister unto Him, and to bless in His Name, unto this day. Wherefore Levi hath no part nor inheritance with his brethren; Jehovah is his inheritance, according as Jehovah thy God promised him.'

It was the duty of the *Kohathites*—not of the Levites generally,—to bear the Ark, N.iv.15. Also the duty of 'blessing in the name of Jehovah' is assigned, not to the Levites, but to the *Priests*, 'Aaron and his sons,' in N.vi.22-27, and is, accordingly, performed by Aaron, in L.ix.22. So, too, 'the *Priests*, the sons of Aaron,' were to stand before Jehovah to minister unto Him, whereas the Levites were to be presented (Heb. 'made to stand') before Aaron the Priest, that they may minister unto him, N.iii.6, or to stand before the congregation, to minister unto them, N.xvi.9, xviii.2.

621. This agrees with what we have already observed of the Deuteronomist, that he knows nothing whatever of that very sharp distinction between the dignities and duties of the *Priests* and *Levites*, which the Books of *Leviticus* and *Numbers* exhibit throughout, and which Jehovah himself is supposed to have made only a few months previously in N.xviii. Accordingly, he calls the *Priests* always 'sons of Levi,' or 'Levites,' and never, as the other writers do, 'sons of Aaron.'

622. Hence he says:—

'For Jehovah thy God hath chosen him (*Levi*) out of all thy tribes, to stand to minister in the name of Jehovah, him and his sons for ever,' xviii.5;

'And, if a *Levite* come from any of thy gates out of all Israel where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which Jehovah shall choose, then he shall minister in the Name of Jehovah his God, as all his brethren the *Levites* do, which stand there before Jehovah. They shall have like portions to eat, beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony,' xviii.6-8.

'And the *Priests*, the sons of *Levi*, shall come near; for them Jehovah thy God hath chosen, to minister unto Him and to bless in the Name of Jehovah,' xxi.5.

623. So, too, in the older laws, the declaration,—

'I am thy part and thine inheritance among the children of Israel,' N.xviii.20— is made only with reference to Aaron

and his sons, that is, it is confined to the *Priests*. And in N.xxxi.28,29, '*Jehovah's tribute*' of the spoil of the Midianites was given to Eleazar the Priest; while the *Levites* received their share from the '*children of Israel*,' v.30. Whereas here it is said, D.x.9, '*Jehovah is the inheritance*' of *Levi*, generally; and in xviii.1,2, we read:—

'The *Priests the Levites*, all the tribe of *Levi*, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel . . . Jehovah is their inheritance, as He hath said unto them.'

624. Here also, and in xxxi.25, the Levites are to carry the Ark, which agrees, as we have said, to some extent, with the command in N.iv.15, and the practice in N.x.21. But in xxxi.9 we read of 'the *Priests*, the sons of *Levi*, the bearers of the Ark.' So in 1K.viii.3 'the *Priests* took up the Ark;' and in 1K.ii.26 Solomon says to the Priest Abiathar,—

'I will not at this time put thee to death, because thou barest the Ark of Jehovah Elohim before David my father.'

In like manner, the *Levites* are to utter the curses, xxvii.14, and to put the Book of the Law 'beside the Ark,' xxxi.26; whereas, according to N.iv.15, the Levites were not even to come near to carry the Ark, till the Priest had covered it; and Aaron was expressly ordered to keep them from touching the holy vessels, N.xviii.3:—

'Only they shall not come nigh the vessels of the Sanctuary and the Altar, that neither they, nor ye also, die.'

*625. D.x.9.

'Wherefore *Levi* had no (E.V. 'hath,' but the Hebrew says, literally, 'there was not to *Levi*') part nor inheritance with his brethren.'

The Deuteronomist, in order to have carried out properly the part of Moses, should have written,—

'Wherefore *Levi* shall have no part with his brethren';—

for the Israelites are still supposed to be only on the point of crossing the Jordan, and no partition of the Holy Land had yet been made among them. It is plain that he writes from a later state of things than that of Moses, when the separate position of the Levites, as ministers of the Sanctuary, was recognised in Israel.

626. D.xi.6.

Here the destruction of the Reubenites, Dathan and Abiram, is mentioned; but nothing is said about the death of the *Levite* Korah, who, according to N.xvi, perished fearfully at the same time, and who was, indeed, as represented in that narrative, the leader in the rebellion in question. Nor is any notice taken of the destruction of the 'two hundred and fifty men, who offered incense.' v.6-11,35.

This, too, agrees with the practice of the Deuteronomist, in making no distinction between Priests and Levites. The sin of Korah and his company is stated to have been this, that, though only *Levites*, they 'sought the *Priesthood* also,' N.xvi.10. This, it would seem, was considered to be not such a very grievous offence in the days of the Deuteronomist.

627. D.xi.14,15.

'I will give you the rain of your land in his due season, the first rain and the latter rain, that thou mayest gather in thy corn, and thy wine, and thine oil. And I will send grass in thy fields for thy cattle, that thou mayest eat and be full.'

Here the writer passes unconsciously, from speaking in the assumed character of Moses, to speaking directly in the person of Jehovah. This single instance—(see also the similar case in xxix.5,6.)—is sufficient to satisfy us as to the real nature of this book and its unhistorical character.

*628. D.xi.29,30.

I have already (229) drawn attention to the fact, that the name 'Gilgal' is here supposed to have been uttered by Moses in his address, before the name was given to the place by Joshua, as related in Jo.v.9. And in the larger edition, III.p.460-465, I have shown that there is no reason to doubt that the Gilgal here mentioned is the famous Gilgal-by-Jericho, and that, consequently, we have here a remarkable anachronism in the narrative. It is open, of course, for any one to say that v.30 is a later interpolation. But what did the Israelites know of *Ebal* or *Gerizim*, at the time when the words in D.xi.29 are supposed to have been addressed to them?

CHAPTER X.

DEUT.XII.1-XIII.18.

*629. D.xii.2-8.

'Ye shall utterly destroy all the places, wherein the nations which ye shall possess served their gods, upon the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree; and ye shall overthrow their altars, and break their pillars, and burn their Asheras (E.V. 'groves') with fire, and ye shall hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place. Ye shall not do so unto Jehovah your God. But unto the place which Jehovah your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put His Name there, even unto His habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come; and thither ye shall bring your burnt-offerings, and your sacrifices, &c. . . . Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes.'

630. Here we have for the first time this announcement, which we find in none of the earlier books of the Pentateuch—not even in N.xxviii, xxix, where the laws of the offerings at the different festivals are laid down, it is supposed, by Jehovah himself, only a few months previously,—but which is repeated again and again in this Book of Deuteronomy,—viz. that there should be one special place, which Jehovah would 'choose out of all the tribes to put His Name there.' All this—(if we assume that Deuteronomy was written at a later age than the rest of the Pentateuch)—is indicative of such a time as that of Hezekiah, 2K.xviii.4, or, more probably, Josiah, 2K.xxiii.4-20, for the composition of this book.

631. The idea, indeed, of *drawing* the affections of the people to Jerusalem, existed, no doubt, in the time of David and Solomon. But the notion of requiring them to bring to the Temple all their 'burnt-offerings, sacrifices, tithes, heave-offerings, and vows,' v.11, and making attendance at Jerusalem *compulsory* three times a year, xvi.16, could scarcely have arisen in an age, when Solomon, though he 'loved Jehovah, walking in the statutes of David his father,' yet 'sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places,' 1K.iii.3, and specially at the 'great high place' of Gibeon, v.4, whereas the Ark, the symbol of God's

Presence, was at that time in the Tabernacle on Mount Zion.

632. Nor could it have originated in an age when the people of the Ten Tribes would have had to travel all the way to Jerusalem for that purpose. We do not read that the prophets of Israel, such as Elijah or Elisha, ever went to Jerusalem to keep the Passover, or obeyed the solemn command to go up thrice in every year to the 'place which Jehovah had chosen.' And the most pious kings, such as Asa, Jehoshaphat, Joash, Amaziah, Uzziah, and Jotham, Hezekiah's grandfather, still sacrificed without hesitation on the high places, and brought their offerings to other altars than that erected in the Temple,—which they would not have done, we must believe, if this law existed, and was known to be of Divine, or even of Mosaic, origin.

633. According to the older law in L.vi, 'sacrifices were to be offered for trespasses of every-day occurrence, e.g.—

'If a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcase of an unclean beast, or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean creeping things, and it be hidden from him, he also shall be unclean and guilty,' L.v.2;

'If he touch the uncleanness of man, whatsoever uncleanness it be that a man shall be defiled withal, and it be hid from him, when he knoweth of it, then he shall be guilty,' v.3;

'If a soul commit a trespass, and sin through ignorance, in the holy things of Jehovah, then he shall bring for his trespass unto Jehovah a ram, &c.' v.15;

'If a soul sin, and commit any of those things which are forbidden to be done by the commandments of Jehovah, though he wist it not, yet is he guilty, and shall bear his iniquity; and he shall bring a ram without blemish out of the flock . . . for a trespass offering, unto the Priest . . . he hath certainly trespassed against Jehovah,' v.18,19.

In short, comparing v.2, above quoted, with L.xi.29,30, where among 'unclean creeping things' are registered the 'mole,' 'mouse,' 'tortoise,' 'frog,' 'snail,' and certain lizards, any one who accidentally touched the carcase of one of these, by that act 'had certainly trespassed against Jehovah,' and must offer a trespass offering.

634. It is, however, impossible to believe that such laws were ever expected literally to be carried out,—much less that they were ever uttered by the Almighty, as in that case they must

have so entirely confused all principles of right and wrong in the minds of the people. They were laid down, as we believe, and shall hereafter give more fully our reasons for believing, in the days of Solomon, when the Temple Services were first instituted, and some 'directory' was needed for the guidance of the Priests in such matters as these, as well as for regulating the supply for the Priests themselves from the offerings of the people. And thus we find the prescriptions laid down, not as for the wilderness only, but especially for the settled life in the Holy Land, by the express mention of 'turtle doves,' and 'young pigeons' as victims in v.7,11.

635. But there is no sign that such laws were promulgated among the people at large: though, doubtless, pious persons were taught by the Priests their duty in this respect, and some would at all times wish to be cleansed, by the appointed course of sacrifice, from any special pollutions of this kind, which they had contracted. It cannot be supposed, however, that for each such offence, however trifling, it was needful for every Israelite, who desired to obey strictly the (supposed) Law of Jehovah his God, to go up with a sacrifice to Jerusalem, whether from the distant Dan, a journey of two hundred miles, or from the trans-Jordanic lands, when that river 'overflowed its banks in time of harvest.' And, though the Deuteronomist seems to include all manner of sacrifices in v.6, yet he seems afterwards, in v.13,14, to restrict the command to 'burnt-offerings' only, and allows that the place, 'which Jehovah would choose to put His Name there,' might be 'too far' for them to allow of their going up to it in order to kill, when they wished to 'eat flesh,' v.15,21.

636. But, doubtless, the Temple, with its comparative grandeur and its choral services, was the means of drawing many from all parts of the land to Jerusalem,—more especially as the older Sanctuaries at Ramah, Bethel, Mizpeh, &c. seem to have been discontinued at the time when David erected his Tabernacle on Mount Zion. The 'high places,' indeed, were still left standing

at Gibeon and elsewhere. And it is possible that many still continued the custom, which the older laws seem to have allowed, E.xx.24, xxiii.14,17, of presenting themselves before Jehovah three times a year, by frequenting the high place nearest to their own neighbourhood. But others, no doubt, would be attracted by the new Temple and its services, which probably surpassed even those of David's Tabernacle. The presence of the Court would be an additional inducement. And, doubtless, also, there was a continual *pressure*, though, perhaps, of a gentle kind, exerted upon the people, to draw them more and more to Jerusalem. Hence we find Jeroboam fully aware of the political tendency of this practice,—

'If this people go up to do sacrifice in the House of Jehovah at Jerusalem, then shall the hearts of this people turn again unto their lord, even unto Rehoboam, king of Judah,' 1K.xii.27.

And, accordingly, he says to the Ten Tribes, 'It is too much for you to go up to Jerusalem,' and sets up the calves in Dan and Bethel, marking these as the principal places of concourse for his people on festal occasions.

637. In Solomon's days, however, the time was not yet ripe for a formal command that 'all the males' should go up to Jerusalem at each of the great Feasts. Rather, the announcement of such a law seems to point to a time, when the Ten Tribes had been carried off into captivity, and *there remained only the small centralised kingdom of Judah*. In that case, the injunction, that all the males should go up to Jerusalem three times a year from all parts of the land, would not have been so utterly extravagant, or so impossible to be obeyed, as the people would all be living within a day or two's journey of the capital. But even then the inconveniences must have been so very great, that it is incredible that such a law could ever have been strictly and habitually acted on, as its language requires. Nor is there any indication in the history of its ever having been put in practice, except once in the days of Josiah, when, probably, as we have seen, this very Book of Deuteronomy had just been found in the Temple.

638. And this view is confirmed, as we have said (632), by the fact that the best of the kings of Judah, down to the time of Hezekiah, are spoken of in the Books of Kings—and without any very *strong* word of censure, though the Chroniclers, writing in a much later day, condemns their conduct in this respect—as allowing the people still to sacrifice in the high places, though the Ark was now set up at Jerusalem, as Asa, 1K.xv.14, Jehoshaphat, xxii.43, Joash, 2K.xii.3, Amaziah, xiv.4, Uzziah, xv.4, Jotham, xv.35. In each of these cases there is some decisive language used in commendation of the king's conduct: thus—

Asa's 'heart was perfect with Jehovah all his days,'—

Jehosaphat 'walked in all the ways of Asa his father, he turned not aside from it, doing that which was right in the eyes of Jehovah,'—

Joash 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, all his days wherein Jehoiada the Priest instructed him,'—

Amaziah, Uzziah, Jotham,—each 'did that which was right in the sight of Jehovah, yet not like David his father; he did according to all things as his father had done.'

And in each case it is added,—

'Howbeit the high places were not removed; the people sacrificed and burned incense still in the high places.'

639. It can hardly be believed that the stringent commands of the Book of Deuteronomy, to 'utterly destroy' all the high places of the heathen, and sacrifice to Jehovah only at Jerusalem, could have been read and studied by these pious princes, much less *copied*, as D.xvii.18–20 directs, by each of them with his own hand, when seated upon the throne of his kingdom. More especially does this apply to the case of Joash, who began to reign when seven years old, 2K.xi.21, and for the greater part of his life was directed wholly by the High Priest, Jehoiada.

640. Hezekiah, 2K.xviii.4, seems to have been the first of the kings of Judah, who set himself to destroy the high places, which, although originally intended for the worship of Jehovah, were probably perverted, more or less, to the practice of idolatry, and, as such, had become fruitful nurseries of vice. In his time, or shortly before it, the prophets, Hosea in Israel, Isaiah and

Micah in Judah, had condemned, in strong terms, the worship on high places.

* They sacrifice upon the tops of the mountains,

And burn incense upon the hills,
Under oaks and poplars and elms,
Because the shadow thereof is good;

Therefore your daughters shall commit whoredom,

And your daughters-in-law shall commit adultery.

I will not punish your daughters when they commit whoredom,

Nor your daughters-in-law when they commit adultery;

For themselves are separated with whores,
And they sacrifice habitually with harlots.
Hos. iv. 13, 14.

* Ye shall be ashamed of the oaks which ye have desired,

And ye shall be confounded for the gardens which ye have chosen.' Is. i. 29.

* For the transgression of Jacob is all this,
And for the sins of the House of Israel.

What is the transgression of Jacob? Is it not Samaria?

And what are the high places of Judah? Are they not Jerusalem? Mic. i. 5.

641. It is probable that such prophetic words as the above were sharpened by the fact of the Ten Tribes having been carried captive in the sixth year of Hezekiah, by which his zeal also may have been stimulated to destroy the high places, and check the other idolatrous practices of Judah, 2K. xviii. 4. But the very expressions in D. xii. 8,—

'Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes,'—

wholly inapplicable, as they must surely be considered to be, to any conceivable condition of the people of Israel, in the 'plains of Moab,' with Moses himself in their midst,—would correspond thoroughly to the feelings of a Prophet writing in the age of Josiah, after the godless reigns of Manasseh and Amon. As RIEHM observes, p. 30 :—

The writer, in these words, betrays his consciousness that the attaching all public worship to one Sanctuary was in his time somewhat new, and that he is putting into the mouth of Moses what he himself could say of his own contemporaries, who sacrificed, as they chose, in various places. It seems to me certain that Moses himself could not have spoken such words as these in D. xii. 8, if the real substance of L. xvii. 1-9 and other laws of sacrifice are really his.

642. Upon the whole, it may be concluded that such a law as this, confining all sacrifices to Jerusalem, could

not have been written before the age of Hezekiah. The destruction of the high places would be a practical measure, which would draw more direct attention to the Temple. In the reign of his son Manasseh, these high places were rebuilt, 2K. xxi. 3, and idolatry again prevailed throughout the land. The short reign of Amon, for two years only, 2K. xxi. 19, continued the same corrupt practices. But then, as we suppose, may have come the time, in the early years of Josiah, when the young king's piety, and the limited extent of his kingdom, together favoured the idea of realising such a unity of worship, by which idolatrous practices (it was hoped) might be effectually and for ever done away, and when the attempt was actually made to enforce attendance at the Temple for all sacrifices, by the authority of a (supposed) Mosaic and Divine law.

* 643. D. xii. 12.

'And the Levite that is within your gates.'

We must here draw special attention to the fact, that the Deuteronomist in this verse, and throughout the whole book, instead of speaking of the Priests and Levites as about to be settled in their forty-eight cities, N. xxxv. 1-8, and as sure to be abundantly supplied with the necessities of life from the sacrifices, tithes, and freewill offerings of the people, represents them everywhere—the *Levites*, at all events, and we have seen that in the term '*Levites*' he includes the '*Priests*'—as likely to be generally in a very necessitous condition, living as stragglers about the land, in 'any of the gates' of the people.

644. It is true that in xvii. 1-8 he makes some provision from the sacrifices for 'the Priests the Levites, all the tribe of Levi,'—though here also, as we shall see (716-720), he is strikingly at variance with the older document. And in xvii. 8-13, xix. 17, xxi. 5, certain judicial duties are assigned to them, at variance again (700-708,) with the provisions of the older law. Further, in xxxiii. 10, 11, he speaks very highly of the office and dignity of the Levites:—

'They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments,
And Israel Thy Law;
They shall put incense before Thee,

And whole burnt sacrifice upon Thine altar. Bless, O Jehovah, his substance, And accept the work of his hands; Smite through the loins of them that rise against him, And of them that hate him, that they rise not again.'

But he makes not the least allusion to their being settled in cities of their own. He takes it for granted that they will be mostly living 'within the gates' of others, and that the ordinary condition of a Levite—at least, of any that had not—

'come from any of the gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which Jehovah should choose,' xviii. 6—

would be one of utter poverty and dependence.

645. Thus, throughout the Book of Deuteronomy, the Levites are coupled continually with the poor and destitute, 'the widow, the stranger, and the fatherless.' And not a word is said of their having any divine right to *demand*, or, at least, to *expect*, the payment of *tithes* from the people, according to the provision, supposed to have been made by Jehovah himself, N. xviii. 21, only a few months before, through Moses, who is now represented to be speaking—

'Behold, I have given the children of Levi all the tenth in Israel for an inheritance.'

646. But they are spoken of, again and again, as depending, like other necessitous persons, mainly upon the charity of others.

'And ye shall rejoice before Jehovah your God, ye, and your sons, and your daughters, and your menservants, and your maidservants, and the *Levite that is within thy gates*, forasmuch as he hath no part nor inheritance with you,' xii. 12; so also v. 18.

'Take heed to thyself that thou *forsake not the Levite*, as long as thou livest upon the earth,' xii. 19.

'And the *Levite*, (because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee,) and the *stranger*, and the *fatherless*, and the *widow*, that are *within thy gates*, shall come, and shall eat and be satisfied,' xiv. 29; so also v. 27.

'And thou shalt rejoice before Jehovah thy God, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the *Levite that is within thy gates*, and the *stranger*, and the *fatherless*, and the *widow*, that are among you,' xvi. 11.

'And, thou shalt rejoice in thy feast, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the *Levite*, and the *stranger*, and the *fatherless*, and the *widow*, that are *within thy gates*,' xvi. 14.

647. So we have 'the Levite and the

stranger that is among you,' 'the Levite, the stranger, the fatherless, and the widow,' xxvi. 11-13; and in xviii. 6 the Levite is actually spoken of as one of the 'strangers' or 'sojourners' within the gates of others. And all this, as we have noted, is supposed to be said by Moses only a few months after the laws had been laid down by Jehovah Himself, which provided for them abundant supplies of food, and cities of their own with their suburbs, thirty-six for the Levites, twelve for the Priests!

Not a trace of this poverty is found in the other books of the Pentateuch.

648. D. xii. 15, 16.

'Notwithstanding thou mayest kill and eat flesh in all thy gates, whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, according to the blessing of Jehovah thy God, which he hath given thee; the unclean and the clean may eat thereof, as of the roebuck and as of the hart. Only ye shall not eat the blood; ye shall pour it on the earth like water.'

It is obvious that this Law is directly at variance with L. xvii. 3, 4, where it is said.—

'What man soever there be of the House of Israel, that killeth an ox, or lamb, or goat in the Camp, or that killeth it out of the Camp, and bringeth it not unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, to offer an offering unto Jehovah before the Tabernacle of Jehovah, blood shall be imputed unto that man, he hath shed blood; and that man shall be cut off from among his people.'

649. D. xii. 17-19.

'Thou mayest not eat within thy gates the tithe of thy corn, or of thy wine, or of thy oil, or the firstlings of thy herds or of thy flock, nor any of thy vows which thou vowest, nor thy freewill offerings, or heave offering of thine hand. But thou must eat them before Jehovah thy God, in the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose, thou, and thy son, and thy daughter, and thy manservant, and thy maidservant, and the Levite that is within thy gates; and thou shalt rejoice before Jehovah thy God in all that thou puttest thine hands unto. Take heed to thyself that thou forsake not the Levite as long as thou livest upon the earth.'

650. But the *tithes* above mentioned belonged *wholly* to the Levites, according to the law in N. xviii. 21, 24, 26, supposed to have been laid down only just before, in the very same year in which this 'last address' of Moses was delivered; and the *firstlings* belonged wholly to the Priests, N. xviii. 15-18.

And here the *people* are to feast upon them, and not to 'forsake' the Levite

within their gates, but admit him to a share in their enjoyment!

The most complete contradiction obviously exists between the two sets of laws, supposed to be uttered, the first directly by Jehovah Himself, the second by Moses, within a few months of each other.

651. SCOTT, with other commentators, imagines a *second* tithe, and says:—

Either the *female firstlings*! [where has one ever heard of these?] or some other of their young cattle, [but the text says distinctly '*firstlings* of thy herds or of thy flock,' comp. D.xii.6,17, xv.19.] being presented as peace-offerings, were thus to be feasted on before the Lord.

But the notion of '*firstling females*,' being here intended is at once set aside by the plain words of D.xv.19,20:—

'All the *firstling males*, that come of thy herd and of thy flock, thou shalt sanctify unto Jehovah thy God. Thou shalt do no work with the firstling of thy bullock, nor shear the firstling of thy sheep; thou shalt —[have the blood sprinkled, and the fat offered, and leave the flesh for the Priests, as commanded in N.xviii.17,18? no, but] *eat* it before Jehovah thy God, year by year, in the place which Jehovah shall choose, *thou and thy household*.'

But SCOTT is not discouraged even here, and writes directly in the teeth of the above text,—

The firstling, *being a male*, was sacrificed, and those parts, which were not burnt upon the Altar, were eaten by the Priests. But, *if it were a female*, it was offered as a peace-offering, and feasted upon by the offerer and his friends.

652. As to the supposed '*second tithe*' it must be said:—

(i) The '*tithes*' are here spoken of just in the same way as the '*firstlings*'; and, if the latter are the same as those spoken of in the old legislation, it is reasonable to suppose that the same is true of the former also;

(ii) If the '*firstlings*' are no longer to be given to the Priests, it is not reasonable to suppose that the '*tithes*' of the old Law would be left for the Levites;

(iii) Not a hint is given of the (supposed) *first tithes* in Deuteronomy, nor of the *second tithes* in the law of N.xviii, supposed to be laid down by Jehovah a few months previously;

(iv) Not a word is said in D.xviii.3,4, of the *tithe* of the *first tithe* forming any portion of the income of the Priests, as commanded in N.xviii.28.

653. D.xiii.12-16.

'If thou shalt hear say in one of thy cities, which Jehovah thy God hath given thee to dwell there, saying, Certain men, children of Belial, are gone out from among

you, and have withdrawn the inhabitants of their city, saying, Let us go and serve other gods, which ye have not known; Then shalt thou enquire, and make search, and ask diligently; and behold, if it be truth, and the thing certain, that such abomination is wrought among you, thou shalt surely smite the inhabitants of that city with the edge of the sword, destroying it utterly, and all that is therein, and the cattle thereof, with the edge of the sword. And thou shalt gather all the spoil of it into the midst of the street thereof, and shalt burn with fire the city, and all the spoil thereof, every whit, for Jehovah thy God; and it shall be an heap for ever; it shall not be built again.'

654. SCOTT remarks on this passage thus:—

Many distinctions have been made, both by Jewish and Christian expositors, to abate the severity of this law: but the text gives no countenance to any of them. It should not, indeed, be supposed that the crime was charged on the city, unless a majority of the inhabitants concurred in it, or that any individuals, who had entirely escaped the general contagion, might not separate from their guilty neighbours; and, perhaps, space might on some occasions be allowed for repentance. The destruction of the spoil would evince that the prosecution and execution were not the effect of avarice, but of zeal for the honour of God and religion; and nothing can be conceived more suited to restrain the people from idolatry than this statute. But *we never read that it was carried into execution*, and have reason to think that this neglect was a national sin, which hastened the Babylonish Captivity. Had some mortified limbs been cut off, the life of the state might have been prolonged.

655. Such a law, it is plain, could never have been carried out in this legal form. How were they to put a city on its trial, for the offence in question, so as to give it an opportunity of clearing itself of the charge? And was every city to be destroyed, and utterly exterminated in this way, where, perhaps, an unruly mob—the majority—might have become for a time too strong for the better souls among them? And were these, too, to be involved in the general ruin? For, as SCOTT says, the text gives no countenance to any abatement of the severe rigour of the law.

656. Probably, this law merely represents the strong feeling of the Deuteronomist upon the subject of idolatry. If it were possible, this is what he would have done to a city guilty of such abominations, which brought down the wrath of God upon Israel; this is what

might very justly be done to it; this is what such a city deserved in the eyes of God and of all good men. In this way he seeks to stir up a pious horror of the accursed sin. And the text points to a time when such guilt was prevalent.

CHAPTER XI.

DEUT.XIV.1-29.

657. D.xiv.3-20.

We have here a repetition of the animals, allowed and disallowed for food, as in L.xi. The laws laid down are almost identical, except that the Deuteronomist—

(i) Names the clean beasts, v.4,5, which the other writer does not,—

(ii) Introduces among the birds some bird of prey, *dayah*, v.13,—

(iii) Omits mention of the locusts, as allowed for food, and of eight unclean animals, named in L.xi.29,30, where are reckoned together in the same category as 'creeping things,' the 'weasel, mouse, tortoise, ferret, chameleon, lizard, snail, and mole.'

658. The animals whose names are italicised above, are identified by Hebrew scholars, while there may be doubts about the others. Perhaps, the Deuteronomist passes these over, because in his more advanced time it was no longer necessary to forbid their being used as food.

But, in fact, the command which is given in D.xiv.19,—

'Every creeping thing that flieth is unclean unto you, they shall not be eaten,'—

is directly at variance with that in L.xi.21-23, where we read—

'These ye may eat, of every creeping thing that flieth,'—

and four forms of the locust are named.

659. In L.xi.5,6, D.xiv.7, the *coney* and *hare* are spoken of as 'chewing the cud.' This, as KNOBEL says, is a mistake, which has probably arisen from the fact of these animals moving their jaws when they eat, as if they were chewing the cud, 'whence to all outward appearance they seemed to the ancients as ruminants.' On this point I may quote the authority of Prof. OWEN, who says,—

'The Hare does *not* chew the cud: it has not the stomach of a ruminant.'

660. For the following information also I am indebted to Mr. BARTLETT, the superintendent of the Royal Zoological Gardens, London.

I have several hares living in the collection; and, having for some years carefully studied these animals in every stage of their existence, in order, if possible, to obtain a cross between this animal and the rabbit, to which it is nearly allied, I have in consequence become well acquainted with its habit and structure, both external and internal. My frequent examination of the stomach and intestines has convinced me that these animals have not the power to ruminate, and consequently that they 'do not chew the cud.'

The structure of the stomachs of all ruminating animals is remarkable, and well known to comparative anatomists. And this peculiar structure does not exist in any of the Order 'Rodentia,' to which the hare belongs.

But these animals possess very fleshy lips, and the muscles of the mouth are largely developed. By these means the parts are moved with great ease, and are kept in almost constant motion; and this, when noticed by persons whose knowledge of the subject is limited, might easily lead them to believe that the animal was chewing. This has, doubtless, led to the mistake made by the early writers.

661. D.xiv.22-27.

'Thou shalt truly tithe all the increase of thy seed, that the field bringeth forth year by year. And *thou shalt eat* before Jehovah thy God, in the place which He shall choose to place His Name there, *the tithe of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the firstlings of thy herds and of thy flocks*; that thou mayest learn to fear Jehovah thy God always. And, if the way be too long for thee, so that thou art not able to carry it, or if the place be too far from thee, which Jehovah thy God shall choose to set His Name there, when Jehovah thy God hath blessed thee, then shalt thou turn it into money, and bind up the money in thine hand, and shalt go unto the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose. And thou shalt bestow that money for whatsoever thy soul lusteth after, for oxen, or for sheep, or for wine, or for strong drink, or for whatsoever thy soul desireth; and thou shalt eat there before Jehovah thy God, and *thou shalt rejoice, thou and thine household, and the Levite that is within thy gates*; thou shalt not forsake him; for he hath no part nor inheritance with thee.'

662. In this passage, the permission is given that, if the way was too long, the whole of the *tithes* and *firstlings* might be turned into money; and the person must go up with his money in his hand, 'to the place which Jehovah shall choose,' and there buy with the money—

'What his soul lusteth after, oxen, sheep,

wine, strong drink, whatsoever his soul desireth ;—

and the good things thus provided were to be 'eaten before Jehovah' by the man and his household, and—

'The Levite that is within thy gates—thou shalt not forsake him.'

663. But no such provision is made, for the conversion of the *firstlings* into money, in N.xviii.17, a law supposed to be given by Jehovah Himself only a few months previously, which says :—

'The firstling of a cow, or the firstling of a sheep, or the firstling of a goat, thou shalt not redeem; they are holy; thou shalt sprinkle their blood upon the Altar, and shalt burn their fat for an offering made by fire, for a sweet savour unto Jehovah.'

And, as before observed (650), all the meat of the firstlings was expressly given to the *Priests* by the law in N.xviii.18, where we read,—

'And the flesh of them shall be thine, as the wave-breast and as the right shoulder are thine.'

So, too, the *tithes* (except a tenth of them which was to be given to the *Priests*) were expressly to be consumed by the Levites, according to the law in N.xviii.25-32, where it is said, v.31—

'Ye (the *Levites*) shall eat it in every place, ye and your households; for it is your reward for your service in the Tabernacle of the Congregation.'

664. Here, however, in D.xiv.22-27, it is ordered, in direct contradiction to the above laws,—issued, according to the story, *from the mouth of Jehovah Himself*, N.xviii.8,20,25, only a few months previously,—that the man who offers, and his family, and 'the Levite that is within his gates,' shall make a feast upon the produce of both the *Priests' firstlings* and the *Levites' tithes*, at Jerusalem, xii.6,17-19, xiv.22-27, xv.19-23, whereas the Levites were to have eaten them at their homes 'in every place.'

665. SCOTT, as we have seen (651), takes refuge in the notion of 'female firstlings,' and a 'second tithe.'

These verses require a second tithe from the produce of the land, which, with that appropriated for the maintenance of the Levites, amounted to a fifth part.

This agrees with JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* IV. viii.8 :—

Let there be taken out of your fruits a tenth, besides that which you have allotted to give to the *Priests* and *Levites*. This you

may indeed sell in the country; but it is to be used in those feasts and sacrifices, that are to be celebrated in the holy city.

But, if this be a *second tithe*, how is it, we repeat, that the Deuteronomist gives no intimation of this fact, and *makes no mention whatever of the first tithe*, to be contributed for the support of the Levites? Nor, when summing up the income of the *Priests* in D.xviii.1-5, does he take any account of the *tenth of the tithes*, which they were to receive from the Levites, N.xviii.25-32, or mention anywhere the tithe of *cattle*, L.xxvii.32,33.

666. The fact seems to be, as we have intimated, that the Book of Deuteronomy only represents the state of ecclesiastical matters, which existed in the *later* days when that book was written. As already observed, the *Priests* are called by the later Prophets, as they are by the Deuteronomist, '*Levites*,' simply. Jer.xxxiii.18,21,22, Ez.xliii.19, xlv.10,15, xlv.5, xlviii.13, or '*sons of Levi*,' Ez.xl.46, Mal.iii.3, comp. Mal.ii.4,8,—and never '*sons of Aaron*;' and so Jeroboam is censured, 1K.xii.31, for making *Priests* of men, '*which are not of the sons of Levi*.' The name of Aaron, in fact, is but incidentally mentioned *once* by all the Prophets, Mic.vi.4; and Ezekiel calls the *faithful Priests* by the title '*sons of Zadok*,' xl.46, xliii.19, xlv.15, xlviii.11,—not '*sons of Aaron*.'

667. It is probable, indeed, that we very greatly over-estimate the *number* and *importance* of the *Priests* in the time of the kings, taking for granted that they really enjoyed the privileges and dignities, which are assigned to them by the laws of the Pentateuch. Yet, if we carefully examine the more authentic history of the later kings, which we find in the Second Book of Kings, we shall perceive indications that their number was but small and their influence inconsiderable. In the days of Josiah there were a '*chief Priest*,' some '*Priests of the second order*,' and others who are called '*keepers of the door*,' 2K.xxiii.4. These '*door-keepers*' are expressly called '*Priests*' in 2K.xii.9; and in the time of Josiah's son, Zedekiah, there were only *five* '*Priests*'

ministering in the Temple, 2K.xxv.18, viz. one 'chief Priest,' one 'second Priest,' or 'Priest of the second order,' as in 2K.xxiii.4, and three 'keepers of the door.'

668. This very office of 'door-keeper,' however, is so totally unlike any assigned to the Priests in the earlier Books of the Pentateuch, that the question is naturally suggested whether these 'Priests of the second order' do not, in reality, correspond to the *Levites* of those Books, from among whom, we should suppose, these door-keepers would be taken. At any rate, it is easy to see how the Deuteronomist, if writing in these later days, would make no distinction between the higher and lower clergy, but would call them all by one common name, 'Priests' or 'Levites.' How very little regard, indeed, was paid in those days to the rank and authority of the Priests, is shown by the fact that, when the King of Babylon carried Jehoiachin captive in the eighth year of his reign, we are told of his carrying with him—'all Jerusalem, and all the princes, and all the mighty men of valour, and all the craftsmen and smiths,' 2K.xxiv.14,—

but not a word is said about the Priests. Yet it is plain that some Priests were carried off, since Jeremiah addresses them, Jer.xxix.1; and this may partly account for their being only *five* in number, as we have said, in Zedekiah's time, shortly afterwards, 2K.xxv.18.

669. There is no indication, however, that they were ever very much more numerous. It is common to suppose that there must have been always a large body of Priests and Levites in attendance at the Temple, because the size of the Temple, as well as that of the City itself in Solomon's time, is very commonly over-estimated. As to the City, 'its *circumference*,' says BARTLETT, *Walks about Jerusalem*, p.28, 'at the best never exceeded *four miles*'; and *three* Temples of Solomon* might have

been placed on the ground now occupied by the Church of St. Martin-in-the-Fields in LONDON. We cannot wonder that in Solomon's, as in David's, time we read of only *two* Priests, 1K.iv.4, (who had, doubtless, some attendants,) or that in Zedekiah's time the whole body of ecclesiastics employed at the Temple was only *five*. Indeed, if two or three clergymen can discharge the duties of St. Martin's Church and Parish in London, two Priests and three door-keepers may very well have sufficed for a Temple one-third as large, and for a population so small as the ordinary population of Jerusalem must have been, considering that, at its widest extent, it was not two-thirds of a mile from the centre to the circumference.*

670. It would seem, however, that even for this small body of Priests and Levites the supplies of food were sometimes deficient; and it is very probable that the 'tithes' and 'firstlings' never were duly contributed for their support, as the earlier laws of the Pentateuch direct. Either these laws in Leviticus and Numbers had never been published

* I take no account here of the data of the books of Chronicles, which we have seen to be so very untrustworthy, when unsupported by other evidence. Thus it is stated that 'there came to David to Hebron, to turn the kingdom of Saul to him,' 4,600 Levites and 3,700 Priests of the sons of Aaron, 'and with them Zadok, a young man mighty of valour, and of his father's house twenty and two captains,' 1Ch.xii.26-28. And yet, although David 'consulted with the captains of thousands and hundreds, and with every leader,' about bringing up the Ark, 1Ch.xiii.1, and 'gathered all Israel together' for the purpose, v.5, including, of course, and above all, these 8,300 Priests and Levites, he made use of *laymen* to remove the Ark in the first instance; and when, warned of his fault by the death of Uzzah, 1Ch.xv.12,13, he 'gathered all Israel' again, v.3, and specially 'assembled the (3,700) sons of Aaron and the (4,600) Levites,' v.4, under such solemn circumstances, for so momentous an occasion, only *two* Priests and 862 Levites are reported as answering to the call, v.5-10.

We shall have occasion hereafter to consider more closely the details of the Chronicler's narrative, upon which, in fact, mainly rests the notion that the laws of the Pentateuch were really carried out in Judah before the Captivity. But not a hint is given in the more trustworthy history, 2S.vi, of the presence of these Priests and Levites on either of the two occasions of removing the Ark.

* The Temple was 60 cubits long and 20 cubits wide, 1K.vi.2; that is, since a cubit=1.824 ft., its area was 108 ft. by 36 ft.=3,991 sq. ft. That of the Church of St. Martin's-in-the Fields is 137 ft. 8 in. by 81 ft. not including the steps and portico, (*Lib. of Ent. Knowledge, Egypt. Ant. i.p.89.*)=11,151 sq. ft.

extensively, which is most likely, or, if known to many among the people, they were not regarded as having any special authority, human or divine. And so the Priests and Levites appear to have fared but badly, like clergy in a colonial diocese upon a voluntary system.

671. Having no Levitical cities nor pasture-lands, but living for the most part in a dependent condition, scattered about the land, 'in the gates' of others,—having no regular, abundant, supply from tithes, first-fruits, or firstlings, but deriving their sustenance almost entirely from the casual offerings and sacrifices, which pious persons brought to the Temple,—they seem, under the later kings, to have been often in real distress for the very necessities of life. It is reasonable to believe that, in the time of David and Solomon, a portion of the royal revenues was applied directly to the support of Divine Worship. Even Saul had such a revenue, as we may gather from the language used in 1S.viii.15,—

'he will take the tenth of your seed, and of your vineyards, and give to his eunuchs and to his servants;—'

though these words were, no doubt, written at a much later date, perhaps in the days of Solomon, and may express, rather, the practice of that time.

672. But under the later kings—at all events, in the record of the Chronicler—we have unmistakable indications of the poverty of the Priests. We find such indications in the disorderly and impoverished state, in which the Temple itself was found in the days of Hezekiah, at the end of the idolatrous reign of his father Ahaz:—

'They have shut up the doors of the porch, and put out the lamps, and have not burnt incense nor offered burnt-offerings in the holy place unto the God of Israel. . . . And the Priests went into the inner part of the House of Jehovah to cleanse it, and brought out all the uncleanness that they found in the Temple of Jehovah into the court of the House of Jehovah. And the Levites* took it, to carry it

out abroad into the brook Kidron.' 2Ch.xxix.7,16.

Ahaz himself, the Chronicler tells us, had 'shut up' the Temple, 2Ch.xxviii.24, which he could hardly have done, if the Levites had been an important and influential body. At all events, their receipts from tithes, &c., must, according to this account, have been very small in his reign.

673. Moreover, we are told that Hezekiah ordered afresh the courses of the Priests and Levites, and provided for their maintenance, by enjoining that tithes and firstfruits should be brought in, and they were brought in abundantly 'in heaps.'

'Then Hezekiah questioned with the Priests and Levites concerning the heaps. And Azariah, the chief Priest of the House of Zadok, answered him and said, *Since the people began to bring the offerings into the House of Jehovah, we have had enough to eat, and have left plenty.*' 2Ch.xxxi.9,10.

It would seem from the above that, before the order in question was issued, the Priests and Levites had not enough to eat. And this is the testimony of the Chronicler, whose tendency to magnify the office and position of the Priesthood and Levitical body is evident throughout his narrative.

674. But the numerous passages in Deuteronomy, which include the Levite with the poor and destitute, with 'the widow, the fatherless, and the stranger,' furnish far more satisfactory evidence of the generally needy condition of the ecclesiastical body in the time of the later kings, supposing, as we may now do, (with the evidence which we have had already before us, and which we shall find still further confirmed as we proceed,) that this Book was written about the time of Josiah. This being the case, it can scarcely be doubted that the laws which we are now considering, D.xii.17-19, xiv.22-27, were intended to secure some better provision for the support of this necessitous priesthood.

675. The original tithe-system, as

* These 'Levites' only appear in the Chronicler's narrative, (see note preceding,) as distinguished sharply from the 'Priests.' It is probable that, in the time of Hezekiah, 'the Priests the Levites'—not, perhaps, the *Chief* Priest, but one or more 'Priests of the se-

cond order,'—had actually the duty of 'carrying out' in person the refuse of the sacrifices and other rubbish of the Temple, 'into a clean place without the (camp) city'='abroad into the brook Kidron.' See Part I.ch.iv.

laid down in the book of Leviticus, was evidently no longer effective, if, indeed, it was ever at any time fully put into operation, which seems very doubtful. Here, however, it would seem, an attempt is made to exchange it for one much more likely to be popular, and practically effective; since the tithes on this system were to be consumed in feasting by the tithe-payer and his family, the poor Levite 'within their gates' being included only as a guest. It is evident that any single *wealthy* farmer, who made it a religious duty to obey such a law as this, when promulgated under the combined influence of priestly, prophetic, and royal authority, would be likely to bring many firstlings of his cattle and sheep annually, far more than he himself and his family could consume in feasting. Thus the ecclesiastics of the Temple would have a reasonable probability of *sharing*, at all events, in the enjoyment of these good things; though, according to the Levitical Law, they *had a right to the whole*.

676. D.xiv.28,29.

'At the end of three years thou shalt bring forth all the tithe of thine increase the same year, and shalt lay it up within thy gates. And the Levite, because he hath no part nor inheritance with thee, and the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow, which are within thy gates, shall come and shall eat and be satisfied; that Jehovah thy God may bless thee in all the work of thine hand which thou doest.'

SCOTT maintains here also the notion of a 'second' tithe, and quotes from MEDE as follows:—

Two years together they paid the *Levites'* tithe and the *festival* tithe. But in the third year they paid the *Levites'* tithe and the *poor man's* tithe, that is, what was wont in other years to be spent in feasting, [and which was now to be spent on the poor at home].

JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* IV. viii. 22 explains the matter by a *third* tithe, to be paid in the third year, and introduces Moses as saying:—

Besides these two tithes, which I have already said you are to pay every year, the one for the Levites, the other for the festivals, you are to bring every third year a tithe to be distributed to those that want, to widows also, and to orphans.

677. But both these explanations of the difficulty are at once set aside by

the fact that, if the tithe named in D.xii.17,18,xiv.22-27, be the 'second' tithe, and that in D.xiv.28,29, the 'third' tithe, both of which were to be *shared* by the Levite with others, then in all the Book of Deuteronomy no mention whatever is made of the 'first' tithe, which belonged wholly to the Levites.

678. Those, however, who speak of a 'second' and 'third' tithe, merely *assume* that the 'first' or Levites' tithe was actually paid, because it was enjoined in N.xviii.20-24. But there is not a trace of any such payment having been made throughout the whole history of the books of Judges, Samuel, and Kings; and in the books of Chronicles, as we have seen, there are distinct indications of the contrary. Nor is a single word said about this Levites' tithe throughout the whole Book of Deuteronomy,—not in xviii.8, where the provision for the Levites out of the sacrifices is mentioned,—

'they shall have like portions to eat, beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony;—

still less in xiv.28, where it is expressly commanded that 'the Levite,' as well as 'the stranger, and the fatherless, and the widow,' shall 'come and eat' of this 'poor man's tithe'—having already, it is supposed, received their own full tithe, 'the Levites' tithe,' that year—'and be satisfied.'

679. There can be little doubt that *one and the same* tithe is meant throughout,—that which in N.xviii is ordered to be given wholly to the Levites, as the firstlings were to be given to the Priests. And it seems probable that the Deuteronomist,—though he had enjoined in xii.17,18, xiv.22-27, that the annual tithe and the firstlings should be spent in feasting at Jerusalem, with the view (675) of securing in this way, for the Priests and Levites, some share, at least, in those good things, which *ought* to have been given *wholly* to them, but which in his own time, at all events, were not so given,—yet was not very sanguine even of this modification of the original direction being generally obeyed. Hence, it may be, he has introduced this additional provision for the third year's

tithe to be eaten *at home*, expecting, perhaps, that this mode of disposing of the tithe would be more popular, and more likely to be observed, than the more strict one of taking it up to Jerusalem. This command, at all events, might be pretty generally obeyed, if the other was disregarded.

680. This view of the case seems rather confirmed by the fact, that this 'third year's tithe' is most insisted on by the Deuteronomist, both here, xiv. 22, and in xxvi. 12, where the 'third year' itself is called the 'year of tithing.' It would seem that each pious person, who might be disposed to carry out this law, was to be left at liberty to reckon his third year as he pleased. KNOBEL, indeed, suggests that these triennial tithes were meant to fall due in the *third* and *sixth* years after each Sabbatical year. But, if this had been intended, it is reasonable to believe that some such definition of this 'third' year would have been made in the text. In fact, in that case, the writer would, most probably, have mentioned explicitly *both* the 'third' and 'sixth' years.

681. It may, indeed, be thought that this 'third year's tithe' was meant to be given *wholly* to the poor, since it is not expressly said here, as in xii. 18, that the householder and his family were to feast upon them as well as the Levite, &c. But the language used with reference to this same tithe in xxvi. 13, 14, seems to imply that the giver was expected to partake of them himself,—and if so, then, of course, in common with the members of his family,—but only on proper occasions of festivity, not for unlawful or unbecoming uses: since he is made to say,—

'I have consumed (E.V. 'brought away') the hallowed things out of mine house, and also have given them unto the Levite, &c.; I have not eaten thereof in my mourning, neither have I consumed (E.V. 'taken away') ought thereof for the dead.'

It would surely have been said, 'I have not consumed ought thereof *at all, for any purpose*,' if it had been intended that the tithe should be given *wholly* away.

682. In Am. iv. 4, 5, we read:—

'Come to Bethel, and transgress; at Gilgal multiply transgression; and bring your sacri-

fices every morning, *your tithes after three years*; and offer a sacrifice of thanksgiving with leaven, and proclaim and publish the free-offerings: for this liketh you, O ye children of Israel, saith Jehovah Elohim.'

These words appear to have been addressed *ironically* to the people of the Ten Tribes, who are represented as substituting outward observances—and these, perhaps, idolatrous—for purity of heart and life. It is difficult, however, to see what is exactly meant by the expression, 'your tithes after three years.' The LXX has 'your tithes for the three-days' feast.' But, at any rate, they cannot imply that the command for the triennial tithe in D. xiv. 28 was actually carried out in the kingdom of Israel,—(which, indeed, under any circumstances, could hardly have been expected,)—since D. xiv. 28 expressly enjoins that the third year's tithe should be feasted on *at home*, 'within thy gates,' whereas here the tithes, whatever they may be, are taken to the sacred place, Bethel or Gilgal.

683. If the translation of the English Version is correct, we might suppose that, among the Ten Tribes, tithes were really paid at this time with some readiness, once in three years, perhaps for the support of the Priesthood which Jeroboam had appointed, and perhaps by his order or suggestion. And this might also be held to imply that in the immediately foregoing time of Solomon the annual tithe-system, enjoined in the book of Numbers, and, as we believe, first laid down in that reign, with a view to the maintenance of the Priests in attendance at the new-built Temple, was really carried out to some extent. This example may have been copied by Jeroboam for the maintenance of his own Priesthood, though he modified it to a *triennial* tithe; and from this modification may even have been derived the idea of the later law of the Deuteronomist in xiv. 28.

684. In the story of Tobit, indeed, we have a full account of *first*, *second*, and *third* tithes, *every* year, and of other dues being paid in the most regular manner, and of the Feasts being regularly kept, and of his going up to Jerusalem to keep them, before the captivity of the Ten Tribes.

'Now all the tribes which together revolted, and the house of my father Nephthali, sacrificed unto the heifer Baal. But I alone went *often* [why not *always*, as the Law enjoined, E.xxiii.17, xxxiv.23?] to Jerusalem at the Feasts, as it was ordained unto all the people of Israel by an everlasting decree, bearing the first-fruits and tenths of increase, with that which was first shorn; and them gave I at the altar to the Priests the sons of Aaron. The first tenth of all increase I gave to the sons of Aaron, who ministered at Jerusalem; [the command in N.xviii.21 says it should be given to the Levites;] another tenth part I sold away, and went and spent it every year at Jerusalem, and the third I gave unto them to whom it was meet.' I.5,8.

685. But the story of Tobit is notoriously a mere fiction, written long after the Captivity. The above statement, however, accords with the well-known fact that, after the return from the Babylonish Captivity, great efforts were made to carry out more strictly the laws of the Pentateuch—those of the earlier books, as well as those of Deuteronomy. The difficulty, which we have been considering, about the *tithes*, was probably then perceived, and, perhaps, by some pious persons obviated in the way described by Tobit. But, as we have noted above, the law gave the tithes to the *Levites*, not to the Priests 'the sons of Aaron.'

686. BLEEK, while maintaining that the Law in N.xviii is genuine Mosaic, writes with reference to the law in Deuteronomy as follows, p.215:—

No one, upon an unprejudiced comparison of these two laws, can mistake the fact, that they vary much from one another, as regards both their contents and character. In the last, strictly speaking, no mention whatever is made of a special *legal* provision by way of tax for the benefit of the Levites, but only of a free-will act of benevolence, which the Israelites are required to show to the landless Levites, just as to other needy persons. Hence they are placed in one and the same rank with the other destitute people, and their whole position is entirely changed. That *Moses himself*, with reference to the maintenance of the Levites, should have delivered two laws, so different from each other as is their whole character [*within the space of a few months*], cannot well be believed, especially as the former law, just as much as the latter, refers to the time when the tribes of Israel would find themselves in possession of their promised land. We cannot but assume that, if the one law is Mosaic, the other belongs to a later time. And here there can be no doubt that the law in Numbers is the original, which also has all the character of a Mosaic law. On the other hand, in Deuteronomy, we probably possess it in a form, to

which it was changed in a later time,—probably at a time when the original law, with so many other Mosaic directions, had long ceased to be followed, and when the relations also had so settled themselves, that no more hope could be entertained that they ever would again be followed. Then, probably, it was sought in this way, at all events, to awaken the compassion of the Israelites for the, perhaps, in part, very necessitous Levites.

CHAPTER XII.

DEUT. XV.1-XVI.22.

687. D.xv.1-11.

The Deuteronomist here enjoins that every *seventh* year shall be a 'year of release,' or remission of debts, with reference, perhaps, as most commentators suppose, to the Sabbatical Year; though, if he really meant and expected that this law should be *practically carried out* in the Sabbatical Year, it is reasonable to believe, as before observed (680), that he would have more strictly defined the meaning of the expression 'at the end of seven years.'

688. It may be that the writer, ever tender-hearted and considerate for the poor and needy among his countrymen, (as is shown by such a multitude of passages throughout this Book,) has availed himself of one of the older laws about the Sabbatical Year, E.xxiii.11. L.xxv.1-7, (in neither of which passages, however, let it be noted, is a single word said about releasing debts,) to recommend compassion to creditors, and *suggest* to them the duty of remitting debts, which pressed heavily upon their debtors. He may have connected this duty with that portion of the older document, which instituted the Sabbatical Year, (seeking in this way to gain, as it were, the authority of Moses for such remission, after a debt had been long due,) *even if the practice of observing the Sabbatical Year itself had altogether ceased*, or, perhaps, had never even been practised at any time in Israel.

689. For, in the whole history of the Hebrew people, there is no sign of this law of observing the Sabbatical Year having been ever once obeyed. Rather, there is a passage, 2Ch.xxxvi.21, which would tend to prove the contrary, where it is said that—

'the land enjoyed her Sabbaths, for, as long as she lay desolate, she kept Sabbath,'—the reference being plainly to the expressions in L. xxvi. 34, 43. So in his note on 2K. xix. 29, SCOTT remarks:—

The devastations of the Assyrians had, probably, prevented the land from being sown that year; and the next is *supposed* to have been the Sabbatical Year; though *this is the only intimation, in all the history of Israel, that any regard was paid to that institution.*

The passage referred to by SCOTT, 2K. xix. 29, is this:—

'And this shall be a sign unto thee: Ye shall eat this year such things as grow of themselves, and in the second year that which springeth of the same, and in the third year sow ye, and reap, and plant vineyards, and eat the fruits thereof.'

It is evidently a mere conjecture that reference is here made to the Sabbatical Year, without any supporting ground for it.

690. D. xv. 12-18.

This is very nearly a repetition of the law in E. xxi. 2-6, with the exception that the Deuteronomist—

(i) Names the Hebrew *maid*-servant, as well as the *man*-servant,—

(ii) Commands that some means of sustenance shall be given to the bondman set free,—

(iii) Is silent about the ear of the servant, who wished to remain with his master, being bored through with an awl *in the presence of the Judges.*

The fact may be that the 'ear-boring,' which may have suited the earlier and more barbarous age, in which the original law in E. xxi. 6 was, most probably, laid down, may have been wholly out of place in the time of the later kings. And, though the Deuteronomist repeats the ancient law, it is more for the purpose of enjoining such a release of bondservants, than with a view of this obsolete practice being revived.

691. In Jer. xxxiv. 8-22 we have an account given how king Zedekiah—

'had made a covenant with all the people which were at Jerusalem to proclaim liberty unto them, that every man should let his manservant, and every man his maidservant, being a Hebrew or Hebrewess, go free—that none should serve himself of them, to wit, of a Jew his brother.'

Accordingly, we are told, they did so release them, but afterwards—

'turned, and caused the servants, whom they had let go free, to return, and brought them

into subjection for servants and for handmaids.'

Then Jeremiah prophesies, v. 13-17:

'Thus saith Jehovah, the God of Israel: I made a covenant with your fathers in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondmen, saying, At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother an Hebrew, which hath been sold unto thee, and, when he hath served thee six years, thou shalt let him go free from thee: but your fathers hearkened not unto me, neither inclined their ear. And ye were now turned, and had done right in my sight, in proclaiming liberty every man to his neighbour; and ye had made a covenant before me in the House which is called by my Name. But ye turned and polluted my Name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his handmaid, whom he had set at liberty at their pleasure, to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for handmaids. Therefore thus saith Jehovah, Ye have not hearkened unto me in proclaiming liberty, every man to his brother, and every man to his neighbour. Behold, I proclaim a liberty to you, saith Jehovah, to the sword, to the pestilence, and to the famine; and I will make you to be removed to all the kingdoms of the earth.'

692. Upon the above passage we may remark as follows:—

(i) It is plain that, neither before nor after the time here referred to, was it the practice to manumit their Hebrew slaves in the seventh year. And, consequently, this passage, as far as it goes, shows that the command in question was *not* obeyed, even in Judah,—much less in Israel.

(ii) The king and princes seem to have had some strong influence brought to bear upon them, probably, by the urgent representations of Jeremiah himself, and appear at first to have complied with the injunction, either regarding it as Divine, or perhaps only as a proper and humane institution.

(iii) For some reason they afterwards changed their minds, and made no scruple of retracing their steps, either because they had become satisfied, in the interim, that the law in question was *not* of Divine origin, or because more selfish motives prevailed over their religion and humanity.

(iv) The Prophet, in the passage before us, refers—*not* to the older law in E. xxi. 2, but—to the later Deuteronomistic version of it, D. xv. 12, as appears by his quoting from it three expressions:—

- (i) 'be sold unto thee,' instead of E.xxi.2, 'if thou shalt buy';
 (ii) 'and he shall serve thee six years,' instead of E.xxi.2, 'six years shall he serve';
 (iii) 'and thou shalt let him go free from thee,' instead of E.xxi.2, 'he shall go out free for nothing.'

693. Hence it can scarcely be doubted that Jeremiah had been setting before the king and princes the language of the Book of Deuteronomy, then recently found in the Temple in the days of Zedekiah's father Josiah, and written, it may be, with the full cognisance, if not by the hand, of Jeremiah himself, and that this was the influence, which he had brought to bear for a time upon them, whether they believed in the Divine authority of that Book or not.

694. In fact, this prophecy of Jeremiah was uttered about B.C. 595, in Zedekiah's time, Jer.xxxiv.8. And the Book of Deuteronomy, as we suppose, was first publicly produced and acted on by the whole people in the eighteenth year of Josiah, B.C. 624, about thirty years before; and, therefore, it might very well be referred to by the prophet as a well-known document. It is noticeable that Zedekiah and his princes and people made at first a solemn covenant to carry out this command to release their servants, as if moved to it by some appeal of the Prophet, representing it as having issued from Jehovah Himself,—which, no doubt, as a command founded upon the principles of humanity and brotherly kindness, he himself believed it *virtually* did. But, afterwards,—

'they turned, and caused the servants and the handmaids, whom they had let go free, to return, and brought them into subjection for servants and for handmaids,'—

as if they had begun to doubt the Divine authority of this injunction.

695. D.xv.19-23.

Here, again, as in (650), the firstling males of the herd and of the flock are to be feasted on by the offerer and his household, instead of their flesh being given to the Priest.

696. D.xvi.

In this chapter the regular observance of the three great Feasts is enjoined, the addition being now made for the first time,—

'Three times a year shall all thy males ap-

pear before Jehovah thy God in the place which he shall choose,' v.16.

According to the original command, the Passover sacrifice was always to be a 'lamb' or a 'kid,' E.xii.3,21; whereas here we read, v.2,—

'Thou shalt therefore sacrifice the Passover unto Jehovah thy God of the flock and of the herd, in the place which Jehovah shall choose to place His Name there.'

And so writes Dr. M'CAUL, *Examination*, &c. p.60:

If the Israelites had not lambs enough, they could take kids; and, if both failed, we learn from D.xvi.2 that even oxen might be used. From 2Ch.xxx.24, xxxv.7, it appears that in the Passover of Hezekiah and Josiah bullocks were actually employed as well as lambs and kids.

If so, there was certainly a departure in these later days from the law laid down in E.xii.1-10.

697. D.xvi.7.

'And thou shalt roast and eat it in the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose; and thou shalt turn in the morning, and go unto thy tents.'

Upon this RIEHM observes, p.51:—

That the writer is here speaking of the morning following the night in which the Passover was to be eaten,—that is, of the morning of the fifteenth day,—is plain from the context. But, that he here allows those, who had come from other towns to Jerusalem for the festival, to go away home on the morning of the fifteenth, is impossible, since then there could not be held the 'solemn assembly,' v.8, on the seventh day. We can only therefore assume that the Paschal lamb was slaughtered at the Temple,—(and what else could have been sprinkled with the blood, except the Altar, if it was slain at all at Jerusalem? comp. 2Ch.xxxv.11)—and eaten in the fore-court of it, and that the writer in the above words allows every one to return in the morning from the Temple-court, to the hostel in Jerusalem in which he was living during the feast.

698. The above seems to be the true explanation of the passage; and in this very way, probably, the famous Passover in Josiah's time was actually carried out. This, of course, excludes the notion of so many sheep and cattle having been killed, and cooked, and eaten, in the Temple-court on this occasion, as the Chronicler states, viz. 37,600 lambs and kids, and 3,800 oxen, 2Ch. xxxv.7,8,9,—which we have shown (148-153) to be impossible. The more trustworthy historian—perhaps, Jeremiah himself—says nothing of all these, but merely writes, 2K.xiii.22—

'Surely there was not holden such a Passover, from the days of the Judges that judged Israel, nor in all the days of the Kings of Israel, nor of the Kings of Judah, but in the eighteenth year of King Josiah, wherein this Passover was holden to Jehovah in Jerusalem.'

The Deuteronomist also, as we have said (519), makes no mention whatever of the 'Feast of Trumpets' and 'Great Day of Atonement,' the celebration of which is enforced in Lxxiii as solemnly as that of the three Great Feasts.

CHAPTER XIII.

DEUT. XVII. 1-20.

699. D.xvii.2-7.

'If there be found among you . . . man or woman, that hath wrought wickedness in the sight of Jehovah thy God, in transgressing His Covenant, and hath gone and served other gods, and worshipped them, either the Sun, or Moon, or any of the Host of Heaven, . . . then shalt thou bring forth that man or that woman, . . . and shalt stone them with stones, till they die. . . . So thou shalt put the evil away from among you.'

In this passage the Deuteronomist again expresses strongly his abhorrence of all manner of idolatry, and especially, v.3, of the worship of 'the Sun, or Moon, or any of the Host of Heaven,' of the prevalence of which, as we have said (596), the first intimation, in the more authentic history of the kings of Judah, is found in the reign of Josiah's father, Manasseh, 2K.xxi.3,5.

700. D.xvii.8-13.

'If there arise a matter too hard for thee in judgment, . . . then shalt thou arise, and get thee up into the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose, and thou shalt come unto the Priests the Levites, and unto the Judge that shall be in those days, and enquire, and they shall show thee the sentence of judgment. . . . And the man that will do presumptuously, and will not hearken unto the Priest . . . or unto the Judge, even that man shall die; and thou shalt put away the evil from Israel, and all the people shall hear and fear, and do no more presumptuously.'

KUENEN, p.150, is of opinion that we have here a reference to the High Court of Judicature, said by the *Chronicles* to have been established by Jehoshaphat in Jerusalem, 2Ch.xix.8-11.

701. Assuming this view of the case to be true, the fact of Jehoshaphat having been the *first* to establish such

a Court would rather tend to show that the law in Deuteronomy was *not* Mosaic and Divine, since Jehoshaphat's act is spoken of as quite a novel one, without any reference to this law.

It seems doubtful, however, if there is really any reference here to such an ecclesiastical Court, as that supposed to be described in 2Ch.xix.8-11, or to any regular Court at all. The very language which is here used by the Deuteronomist,—

'Thou shalt come unto the Priests the Levites, and unto the Judge that shall be in those days,'—'the man that will not hearken unto the Priest that standeth to minister there before Jehovah thy God, or unto the Judge'—

is so vague and uncertain, as rather to imply the contrary.

702. It may be doubted also, perhaps, whether the Chronicler is here giving an account of some one particular High Court of Judicature first established by Jehoshaphat, or whether his statements, so far as we can depend upon them, should be understood as saying more than that Jehoshaphat, like our HENRY II, was traditionally famous as a judicial reformer. It is possible, indeed, that his *name*, which means 'Jehovah *judges*,' may have some connection with this account of his judicial arrangements. It may have had a real historical connection with them in Jehoshaphat's lifetime; or it may have given rise to the tradition of this king's having taken a lively interest in such matters; or it may have suggested to the Chronicler himself the probability of his having set the courts of justice in his time in active operation, as described in the narrative.

703. Of course, in the later days of the monarchy, and above all in the time of Josiah, who came to the throne at eight years of age, 2K.xxii.1, the chief and other principal Priests must have been persons of some consequence in Jerusalem, and would naturally be called to take a part in the decision of important causes, especially any connected with matters ecclesiastical. And so in D xix.17,18, we read,—

'Then both the men, between whom the controversy is, shall stand before Jehovah, before the Priests and the Judges, which shall be in those days; and the *Judges* shall make diligent inquisition,' &c.

If, however, reference is here supposed to be made to a regular Court, then it deserves to be noted (as a token that the writer is not Moses himself) that the Court is not here introduced as one established by Moses, only to be called into operation hereafter, but is set forth as already existing.

704. It need hardly be said that the notion of referring all difficult matters to the Priests the Levites,—

'by whose word shall every controversy and every stroke be tried,' D.xxi.5,—

could never have arisen in the days of David and Solomon, or any of the more powerful kings of Judah, who, we may be certain, decided themselves, as a Supreme Court, either in person or by their judicial officers, all such questions. Thus we are told that David 'executed judgment and justice unto all people,' 2S.viii.15; and Solomon prays for 'an understanding heart,' that he may be able to 'judge so great a people,' 1K.iii.9. And, accordingly, we have very soon an instance of his deciding personally in such a case between the two women, 1K.iii.16-27; and it is added, v.29,—

'And all Israel heard of the judgment, which the King had judged; and they feared the King; for they saw that the wisdom of God was in him to do judgment.'

705. And this is confirmed when we observe the very subordinate position which the principal Priests occupy in the lists of the great officers of David and Solomon. Here, instead of finding—as we might expect from what we observe in the Pentateuch and book of Joshua, (where Aaron always ranks *next* to Moses, and Eleazar to Joshua, or even *before* him, Jo.xiv.1,)—that the High Priest is named, as first in honour and highest in rank and dignity, next to the King, we have mentioned, first, the chief captain, Joab—then the recorder, Jehoshaphat,—*then* the Priests, Zadok and Ahimelech,—the scribe, Seraiah,—the captain of the guard, Benaiah,—and, last of all, it is added, 2S.viii.16-18,—

'And David's sons were *chief rulers*.'

And we find the Priests in a still lower position in Solomon's time, 1K.iv.1-6.

706. It is also very noticeable that the word translated 'chief rulers' in

2S.viii.18 is in the original 'Priests.' It stands distinctly 'David's sons [*of the tribe of Judah*] were Priests.' The Hebrew word is the same as is used everywhere else for Priest, *viz.*, *Cohen*,—the same exactly as that used for Aaron, Eleazar, or Phinehas. So in 2S.xx.26 we read,—

'And Ira also, the Jairite, was a Priest (E.V. 'chief ruler') about David.'

And in the passage which has just been quoted from 1K.iv.1-6, the word translated 'chief officer' is properly *the Cohen*, 'the Priest,' and that rendered 'principal officer,' is *Cohen*, 'Priest.' When thus we observe that—not the sons of David alone, but—Ira, the Jairite, also, 2S.xx.26, and 'Zabud, the son of Nathan,' 1K.iv.5, are each designated by this name 'Cohen,' and that 'Azariah the son of Zadok' was 'the Cohen' in Solomon's days, 1K.iv.2, it can scarcely be supposed that the Hebrew word is used exclusively of 'Priests' in the ordinary sense, or that David's sons are called 'Cohanim,' as some suppose, because he had empowered them to exercise certain sacerdotal functions.

707. It is true, no doubt, that David and Solomon themselves *did* discharge Priestly functions on various occasions. And this is one of the numerous evidences, which the history betrays, of the non-existence of the laws of the Pentateuch in their present form in their days, or, at all events, of their not being in operation, and so of their not being regarded in those days as authoritative and Divine. But it is clear that the word 'Cohen' was not used in those times, nor even in the yet later time when the above passages in Samuel and Kings were written, exclusively with reference to religion. The very fact that it could be employed thus freely of *laymen*, shows that the more restricted use of the word, which afterwards prevailed, when the Priestly office became more dignified, had not yet come into vogue. It would be strange that a word, *already exclusively appropriated* to denote such a high sacred office, should be so lightly used of mere laymen.

708. And, in fact, we do not find

the word so used in the later ages of the Jewish history. The Chronicler, indeed, says, 1Ch.xxvii.5,—

‘The third captain of the host for the third month was Benaiah, the son of Jehoiada, the chief Priest, (lit. head Cohen, E.V. margin, ‘principal officer’).’

It is impossible to say what he exactly means by this expression, whether that Benaiah, or Jehoiada, was ‘head Cohen.’ But he probably has adopted the phrase from the passages just quoted, 2S.viii, 1K.iv. At all events, he never uses it again; and, instead of saying that the sons of David were ‘Cohanim,’ he writes, 1Ch.xviii.17,—

‘The sons of David were at the hand of the king.’

In other words, they were, probably, ‘Councillors of State,’ and Azariah the son of Zadok, ‘the Cohen,’ was, perhaps, the ‘President of the Council.’ In course of time, as the Priestly office gained ground, more and more, in position and influence,—though not in wealth,—the word Cohen became restricted to those who were set apart for sacred offices, and had charge of the ministrations of the Sanctuary—just as if in England the word ‘Minister’ should no longer be used for ‘ministers of state,’ but be restricted to ‘ministers of religion.’

*709. D.xvii.14-17.

‘When thou art come unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, and shalt possess it, and shalt dwell therein, and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like as all the nations that are about me, thou shalt in any wise set him king over thee, whom Jehovah thy God shall choose; one from among thy brethren shalt thou set king over thee; thou mayest not set a stranger over thee, which is not thy brother. But he shall not multiply horses to himself, nor cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses; forasmuch as Jehovah hath said unto you, Ye shall henceforth return no more that way. Neither shall he multiply wives unto himself, that his heart turn not away, neither shall he greatly multiply to himself silver and gold.’

It is plain that this passage, which distinctly allows the appointment of a king, and, indeed, would have been enough to have suggested it, if the desire for one had not otherwise arisen,—which, so far from disapproving of the introduction of the kingdom, rather promises a special blessing, and a perma-

nent continuance of royalty, to any pious king and his children,—could not have existed, as the declaration of the Divine Will, in the time of Samuel, or in the still later time of the author of the history of the election of the first king of Israel.

710. There we find Samuel charging it upon the people as a *great sin*, that they had desired a king,—

‘That ye may see that your wickedness is great, which ye have done in the sight of Jehovah, in asking for a king. . . . And all the people said unto Samuel, Pray for thy servants unto Jehovah thy God, that we die not; for we have added unto all our sins this evil to ask us a king.’ 1S.xii.17-19.

Nay, Jehovah himself says to Samuel, 1S.viii.7—

‘They have not rejected thee, but they have rejected Me, that I should not reign over them.’

Throughout the whole narrative, not the least reference is made to this law, as surely must have been the case if it was really in existence in those days; since either Samuel might have been expected to quote it, as laying down the conditions of the kingdom, if they were determined to have it, or the people would naturally have adduced it, as sanctioning, or, at any rate, excusing, their wish for a king.

711. Solomon, as we know, was the first king who ‘multiplied’ horses brought out of Egypt:—

‘And Solomon had forty thousand stalls of horses for his chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen,’ 1K.iv.26;

‘And Solomon gathered together chariots and horsemen; and he had a thousand and four hundred chariots, and twelve thousand horsemen, whom he bestowed in the cities for chariots, and with the king at Jerusalem, 1K.x.26;

‘And Solomon had horses brought out of Egypt. . . . And a chariot came up and went out of Egypt for six hundred shekels of silver, and an horse for an hundred and fifty; and so for all the kings of the Hittites, and for the kings of Syria, did they bring them out by their means,’ 1K.x.28,29.

In later days Jotham also, Hezekiah’s grandfather, did this, as Isaiah implies:

‘Their land is also full of horses, neither is there any end of their chariots,’ Is.ii.7.

And Hezekiah did the same:—

‘Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help, and stay on horses, and trust in chariots, because they are many, and in horsemen, because they are strong!’ Is.xxxi.1;

‘How wilt thou turn away the face of one

captain of the least of my master's servants, and put thy trust on Egypt for chariots and for horsemen?' Is. xxxvi. 9.

712. But, later still, Jeremiah condemns the kings of Judah strongly for going down again to Egypt for help:—

'And now what hast thou to do in the way of Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor? . . . Why gaddest thou about so much to change thy way? thou also shalt be ashamed of Egypt, as thou wast ashamed of Assyria,' ii. 18, 36.

And he speaks in xlii. 15-19 with special emphasis against the people's 'returning' to Egypt to sojourn there.

While, therefore, in forbidding the multiplication of wealth and of wives, special reference may be made by the Deuteronomist to the well-known causes of Solomon's declension, 1K. x. xi, yet such a passage as that before us might very well have been written in the age of Josiah, and by the hand of such a Prophet as Jeremiah.

713. D. xvii. 18-20.

'And it shall be, when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom, that he shall write him a copy of this Law in a book, out of that which is before the Priests the Levites. And it shall be with him, and he shall read therein all the days of his life; that he may learn to fear Jehovah his God, to keep all the words of this Law and these statutes, to do them; that his heart be not lifted up above his brethren, and that he turn not aside from the commandment, to the right hand or to the left, to the end that he may prolong his days in his kingdom, he and his children, in the midst of Israel.'

We observe here, first, that the Book of the Law is said to be '*before the Priests the Levites*,' which seems to imply that, as we have been supposing, the roll, containing the Mosaic story, was left in the custody of the Priests all along, before and after the 'discovery of the Law' in Josiah's days.

714. But here SCOTT observes:—

It is probable that this law was very seldom observed by the kings of Judah, and never by the kings of Israel.

And upon 2K. xxii. 8-11, he says,—

It seems to have been *entirely neglected*, as well as the command to read the Law publicly to the people every year at the Feast of Tabernacles.

It is possible that Josiah, *after* the discovery of this Book by Hilkiah the High Priest in the Temple, may have actually begun, at all events, to copy

the Book of the Law with his own hand. But what sign is there that either David or Solomon each made a copy for himself of this Law, or that any of the best kings did so,—even Joash, as a youth, under the 'direction' of the chief Priest Jehoiada? If they *did*, pious kings as they were, how is it to be explained that they completely neglected its precepts in so many points, as we know they did,—for instance, in sacrificing at Gibeon and other high places, 1K. iii. 3, 4, and in not duly keeping the Passover, 2K. xxiii. 22?

715. On the other hand, if they did *not* make a copy of the Law, why was *this*? Can it be believed that they *knowingly* omitted to do so,—that is to say, that, having the Law itself (as is supposed) in their hands, with Prophets and Priests to remind them of their duties, they wilfully or negligently passed by so solemn, and, indeed, so essential, a part of their duty, to themselves and to their people? Rather, have we not here also a proof, that the Book of Deuteronomy, at all events, was not known to these Kings, or to the Priests and Prophets of their day,—and, therefore, probably, did not exist,—or, at least, if it did, was not recognised as having Divine authority? Indeed, if, instead of writing out the Law, these Kings, or any of their Priests and Prophets, had only *heard* or *read* it, as a Divine Law, it would be equally impossible to explain their surprising disregard of its most plain and positive injunctions, in respect of the Passover and other matters.

CHAPTER XIV.

DEUT. XVIII. 1-22.

716. D. xviii. 1-5.

'The Priests the Levites,* all the tribe of Levi, shall have no part nor inheritance with Israel; they shall eat the offerings of Jehovah made by fire, and his inheritance. Therefore shall they have no inheritance among their brethren; Jehovah is their inheritance, as He hath said unto them. And this shall be the Priest's due from the people, from them that

* As before observed, the translators of the E.V., by inserting 'and' before 'all the tribe of Levi,' have here modified greatly the meaning of the original.

offer a sacrifice, whether it be ox or sheep; and they shall give unto the Priest the *shoulder* and the *two cheeks* and the *maw*. The firstfruit also of thy corn, of thy wine, and of thine oil, and the *first of the fleece of thy sheep*, shalt thou give him. For Jehovah thy God hath chosen him out of all thy tribes to stand to minister in the Name of Jehovah, him and his sons for ever.

Here, again, the Priests and Levites are treated as identically the same. Jehovah is the 'inheritance' of the whole tribe of Levi; whereas in N.xviii.20, He is spoken of as the inheritance of Aaron and his sons only. And, accordingly, in N.xxxi.28,29, as we have seen (623), 'Jehovah's tribute' is given to the Priests alone, and the Levites are supplied from the share of the booty which belonged to the people. Here, also, as in x.8, '*Levi* and his sons'—not '*Aaron* and his sons'—are said to have been—

'chosen out of all the tribes to stand to minister in the Name of Jehovah.'

717. Again, we have here the income of 'the Priests the Levites' laid down, and in this account also there are some notable variations from the original directions.

(i) The firstfruits of *wool* are added, v.4; comp. N.xviii.12.

(ii) The *tithes* are altogether omitted, of which one-tenth belonged to the Priests, and the rest to the Levites.

(iii) A much more sumptuous provision than here is made for the Priests in E.xxix.28, L.vii.31-34, x.14, N.vi.20, xviii.18, *viz.* the breast or *brisket*, and the *hind-leg* (E.V. 'shoulder')—

'The wave-breast and the heave-hind-leg have I taken of the children of Israel from off the sacrifices of their peace-offerings, and have given them unto Aaron the Priest and unto his sons, by a statute for ever from among the children of Israel.' L.vii.34.

718. Here, however, the Priest is only to have 'the *shoulder*, the two cheeks, and the *maw*.' SCOTT remarks—

The two cheeks, (probably, the whole head with the tongue,) and the maw are supposed to have been at this time *first granted* out of the peace-offering, in addition to what had before been allotted to the Priests and Levites; for they are not mentioned in the preceding laws.

But, if this provision for the Priests is an *additional* one, why then is nothing said about the former?

It seems probable that the later more moderate provision was thought to be more suitable to the circumstances of the times in which the writer lived.

719. D.xviii.6-8.

'And if a Levite come from any of thy gates out of all Israel, where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind unto the place which Jehovah shall choose, then he shall minister in the name of Jehovah his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, which stand there before Jehovah. They shall have like portions to eat, beside that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony.'

By 'Levite' is here meant, as usual in this Book, 'Priest.' This appears from the mention made of 'his brethren, the Levites,' as *standing before Jehovah*, a phrase only used of the Priests (620). Besides which, he is spoken of as having a right, like the rest, to have his 'portion' to eat of the sacrifices, which it was only lawful for the *Priests* to partake of, L.vi.18,29, vii.6, though they might, probably, invite others, as an act of favour, to share in the Priest's portion of the *peace-offerings*, L.vii.34.

720. We have here again the representation of the 'Levite' or 'Priest,' living 'in the gates' of others, with no reference of any kind to his living in a Levitical or Priestly city. Further, the language used in this passage implies that the Levites, as a body, were *not* very desirous of being employed at the Sanctuary,—that they did not generally come with 'all the desire of their mind' unto the place which Jehovah had chosen. This corresponds with the general declension of religion, and the impoverished state of the ecclesiastical body, which must have existed towards the close of Manasseh's, and in the beginning of Josiah's, reign.

721. D.xviii.15-22.

'Jehovah thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him shall ye hearken. According to all that thou desiredst of Jehovah thy God in Horeb in the day of the assembly, saying, Let me not hear again the voice of Jehovah my God, neither let me see this great fire any more, that I die not. And Jehovah said unto me, They have well spoken that which they have spoken. I will raise them up a Prophet from among their brethren like unto thee, and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him.'

And it shall come to pass that, whosoever will not hearken unto my words, which he shall speak in my Name, I will require it of him. But the Prophet, which shall presume to speak a word in my Name, which I have not commanded him to speak, or that shall speak in the name of other gods, even that Prophet shall die. And, if thou say in thine heart, How shall we know the word which Jehovah hath not spoken? When a Prophet speaketh in the name of Jehovah, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which Jehovah hath not spoken, but the Prophet hath spoken it presumptuously: thou shalt not be afraid of him.'

722. KURTZ declares himself 'unconditionally in favour of the exclusive reference [of these words] to one distinct individual, viz. the Messiah.'

It is needless, however, to discuss the arguments, which he gives at considerable length in support of his view, that Moses is here distinctly referring to one individual, the Messiah; because we believe that it must now be considered to be a certain conclusion of criticism, that this Book of Deuteronomy was written at a much later date than the others, so that these words can no longer be regarded as words recorded by Moses from the mouth of Jehovah Himself.

723. They appear to embody a promise of Divine help for the people, in any of their future difficulties, as is shown by their connection with the preceding context. 'The Israelites are not to consult diviners, soothsayers, and necromancers, as the heathen do: Jehovah will not leave them under any necessity or with any excuse for doing this. But He will Himself supply them with counsel and comfort, when they need it, by sending some Prophet such as Moses, who, like him, should stand between them and God, should hear the words of God, and deliver them to the people. This is what they desired at Horeb, and they promised to listen, and diligently obey such Divine commands, if only God would speak to them by human mediation, and not with that terrible voice. Jehovah granted their request then, and will do so still, when Moses their present guide is gone. They shall never be without a divinely instructed Teacher, if only they will obey him.'

CHAPTER XV.

DEUT. XIX. 1-XXII. 30.

724. D. xix. 1-10.

'When Jehovah thy God hath cut off the nations, whose land Jehovah thy God giveth thee, and thou succeedest them, and dwellest in their cities and in their houses, thou shalt separate three cities for thee in the midst of the land, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee to possess it. *Thou shalt prepare thee a way, and divide the coasts of thy land, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee to inherit, into three parts, that every slayer may flee thither.* . . . Wherefore I command thee saying, *Thou shalt separate three cities for thee.* And, if Jehovah thy God enlarge thy coast, as He hath sworn unto thy fathers, and give thee all the land which He promised to give unto thy fathers, . . . *then shalt thou add three cities more for thee, beside these three, that innocent blood be not shed in thy land, &c.'*

It seems plain that the writer contemplates only *six* cities of refuge altogether; first, 'thou shalt separate three cities for thee,' v. 2, and then, when their land should be enlarged, 'thou shalt add three cities more for thee, *besides these three,*' v. 9.

And so we read in N. xxxv. 9-15:—

'And Jehovah spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, and say unto them, When ye be come over Jordan into the land of Canaan, then ye shall appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you. . . . Ye shall give three cities on this side Jordan, and three cities shall ye give in the land of Canaan, which shall be cities of refuge. These *six* cities shall be a refuge.'

725. In both the above passages, the designation of the six cities is to be a *future* event, 'when ye be come over Jordan'; in both passages, first, the three cities on the East of Jordan are to be named, and then those on the West; and there is no sign whatever of more than six cities.

But then in D. iv. 41-43 we are told, as of an act *already past*—

'Then Moses severed three cities on this side Jordan toward the sun-rising . . . namely, Bezer in the wilderness, in the plain country, of the Reubenites, and Ramoth in Gilead, of the Gadites, and Golan in Bashan, of the Manassites.'

726. SCOTT supposes *nine* cities to be intended, when the territory of Israel should have reached its full extent:—

Three cities of refuge had already been allotted on the East of Jordan; and the other three were ordered to be set apart, as soon as the people were settled in the coun-

try West of Jordan; and, in case their boundaries should in after ages be enlarged, three more were to be added.

But this explanation, however at first sight plausible, is not consistent with the language of the Deuteronomist, v.2,7,9, which clearly speaks only of *six* cities, in accordance with N.xxxv.9-15. Besides which, it can hardly be thought that, if he had written D.iv.41-43, as it now stands, he would have written also the passage now before us, without making any allusion to the three cities already set apart.

727. But, assuming now that the later origin of this Book has been demonstrated, the matter may be explained as follows. We have observed already (603) that D.iv.41-43 is, perhaps, a *mixed* passage, containing a fragment of the older narrative, retouched by the Deuteronomist. It would seem that the older writer meant these six cities to be named, as soon as the Conquest should be completed; and, as trans-Jordanic lands were already conquered, he represents Moses himself as separating three cities in these lands before his death. The Deuteronomist has removed this passage from its original connection, and placed it at the end of the *first* of the addresses, which he puts into the mouth of Moses. Here, perhaps, he originally intended to have *brought his work to a close*. But, afterwards, he begins again abruptly, v.1, another address, in the course of which he introduces the directions for the six cities being severed, xix.1-10, without noticing, apparently, the contradiction thus caused.

728. It may be observed also that no notice is taken in D.xix of the fact, that in the older document, N.xxxv.6, it is expressly ordered, that these six cities shall be—

‘among the cities which he shall give to the Levites;’

which cities are limited to *forty-eight*, and are afterwards mentioned by name in Jo.xxi, all situated in the districts lying immediately east and west of the Jordan. He *adds* the direction to ‘prepare (keep in order) a way’ to the refuge-cities, and *omits* all reference to

the slayer’s abiding in the city, which he had safely reached—

‘unto the death of the High Priest, which was anointed with the holy oil,’ N.xxxv.25.

729. There is no indication in the history that such cities of refuge ever really existed. But the Deuteronomist shows, in this chapter, and elsewhere, (xix.10,13,xxi.8,9,xxii.8,xxvii.25), great earnestness in warning against the shedding of ‘innocent blood,’ by which the land would be defiled, and guilt lie upon them,—with special reference, we may believe, to the crying sins of his own time. And *Jeremiah* refers repeatedly to such offences as common in his days, vii.6, xix.4, xxii.3,17, xxvi.15, in some of which passages, however, he appears, from the context, to mean the blood of innocent *children*, sacrificed to idols (181). And so we read, perhaps recorded, as we have said (557.v), by the very same hand that wrote the solemn warnings of the book of Deuteronomy,—

‘Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much, till he had filled Jerusalem from one end to another,’ 2K.xxi.16;

‘Surely, at the commandment of Jehovah came this upon Judah, to remove them out of His sight, for the sins of Manasseh, according to all that he did; and also for the innocent blood that he shed, for he filled Jerusalem with innocent blood, which Jehovah would not pardon.’ 2K.xxiv.3,4.

730. D.xix.14.

‘Thou shalt not remove thy neighbour’s landmark, which *they of old time have set* in thine inheritance, which thou shalt inherit in the land that Jehovah thy God giveth thee to possess it.’

This language is that of one writing long after the conquest and division of the land of Canaan, notwithstanding the reference to a future time in the last clause of the verse. Unless, however, we had already proved sufficiently the later age of the Deuteronomist, it would be unsafe to regard it as implied in such a text as the above, since the Hebrew would, probably, allow of the translation, ‘which they of old time *shall* have set, &c.’

731. D.xx.5,6.

‘And the officers shall speak unto the people, saying, What man is there that hath built a new house, and hath not dedicated it? Let him go and return to his house, lest he die in the battle, and another man dedicate it. And

what man is he that hath planted a vineyard, and hath not yet eaten of it? &c.'

The Deuteronomist is plainly here referring to his own times, when houses were built and vineyards planted, and has lost sight of the fact that the wars, in which the people would be engaged for some years, according to the story, would be wars of conquest.

732. D.xx.10-15.

'When thou comest nigh unto a city to fight against it, then proclaim peace unto it. And it shall be, if it make thee answer of peace, and open unto thee, then it shall be that all the people that is found therein shall be tributaries unto thee, and they shall serve thee. And, if it will make no peace with thee, but will make war against thee, then thou shalt besiege it. And, when Jehovah thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword. But the women, and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which Jehovah thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations.'

It is well that we are no longer obliged to believe that the above frightful command emanated from the mouth of the Most Holy and Blessed One. This does not apply to the cities of Canaan only. But *any* city, which the Israelites might decide for any cause to 'fight against,' if it did not surrender on the very first summons, 'make an answer of peace,' and open to the foe, on the condition of becoming 'tributaries and servants,' was, according to this injunction, to be besieged and captured, and to this end the express aid of the Almighty is promised; and then all the males, except young children, are to be put ruthlessly to death.

733. D.xx.16-18.

'But of the cities of these people, which Jehovah thy God doth give thee for thine inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth, but thou shalt utterly destroy them, the Hittites, and the Amorites, the Canaanites, and the Perizzites, the Hivites, and the Jebusites, as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee; that they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods; so should ye sin against Jehovah your God.'

Here also it is well for us to know that these are the words of the later Deuteronomist, and that such commands were never really carried out,

(as we know by the cases of Uriah the Hittite and Araunah the Jebusite), nor ever meant by the writer to be carried out, but express, rather, his burning zeal against the idolatrous vices of his own countrymen in his own age, which he desired thus to brand with infamy, and to represent as worthy only of death. A people, that could practise these abominations, was only fit to be exterminated; and that would surely be the fate of Israel, if they persisted in them, according to the doom here denounced upon the nations of Canaan.

734. D.xxi.7,8.

'And they shall answer and say, Our hands have not shed this blood, neither have our eyes seen it. Be merciful, Jehovah, unto Thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed, and lay not innocent blood unto thy people of Israel's charge.'

We have instances of similar 'liturgical' formulæ in several places in Deuteronomy, e.g. xxi.7,8, xxvi.3,5-10, 13-15, xxvii.15,16; comp. xx.2-8, xxii.16,17, xxv.7-10. The only instance in the other books of the Pentateuch is N.vi.24-26; comp. also N.x.35,36. It may be doubted whether such formulæ were ever really in use, or intended to be used. But, in the case before us, the Deuteronomist gives another indication of the horror which he had of the shedding of 'innocent blood' (729).

735. D.xxi.10-14.

'When thou goest forth to war against thine enemies, and Jehovah thy God hath delivered them into thine hand, and thou hast taken them captive, and seest among the captives a beautiful woman, and hast a desire unto her, that thou wouldest have her to thy wife; then shalt thou bring her home to thine house; and she shall shave her head, and pare her nails; and she shall put the raiment of her captivity from off her, and shall remain in thine house, and bewail her father and mother a full month; and after that thou shalt go in unto her, and be her husband, and she shall be thy wife. And it shall be, if thou have no delight in her, then thou shalt let her go whither she will; but thou shalt not sell her at all for money, thou shalt not make merchandise of her, because thou hast humbled her.'

Here also we have the manners and customs of the writer's age exhibited, and not the justice, mercy, and purity, which would have marked a command really emanating from the Divine Wisdom and Goodness. The Persian Cyrus

or the Roman Scipio, though heathens, taught by their lives a higher morality than this, which, besides the inhumanity involved in it, practically sanctions concubinage and polygamy, as do also the following words, *v. 15-17*—

‘If a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated, &c.’

736. SCOTT remarks here—

By taking the captive into the house, and there keeping her retired, her disposition would be discovered more easily; and, if that proved disagreeable, the passion might abate. The becoming attire and ornaments, in which she might be taken captive, being changed for the mean habit of a mourner, might tend to diminish her attractions (!); ‘shaving her head’ would certainly have this effect; and the words, rendered ‘paring her nails,’ seem rather to mean ‘letting them grow.’ Some, however, think that she was in the interim to be instructed in the Law; and that these were external tokens of her renouncing idolatry, and embracing the religion of Israel.

Only ‘one full month’ was to be allowed for the captive maiden to bewail her parents, and, when ‘humbled,’ she was not to be sold. Probably, the practices of the times, to which the Deuteronomist is here referring, were even more unrighteous and inhuman than this; and the law, which he has here laid down, may have been designed to remedy such evils to some extent.

737. D. xxi. 18-21.

‘If a man have a stubborn and rebellious son, which will not obey the voice of his father or the voice of his mother, and that, when they have chastened him, will not hearken unto them; then shall his father and his mother lay hold on him, and bring him out unto the elders of his city, and unto the gate of his place; and they shall say unto the elders of his city, This our son is stubborn and rebellious; he will not obey our voice; he is a glutton and a drunkard. And all the men of his city shall stone him with stones that he die: so shalt thou put evil away from among you, and all Israel shall hear and fear.’

It can hardly be believed that the above command was ever carried out, or written with a view to its being carried out, as it involves a number of inconsistencies, which will appear sufficiently upon a little consideration.

738. The following is SCOTT’s comment upon the passage.

This law has great wisdom and mercy couched under its apparent severity; and it could not fail of producing most salutary effects, *as far as any regard was paid to it.*

The parents were the only prosecutors; both must concur in the prosecution; [no notice is taken of the case of a widower or widow having a rebellious son, or of a son being disobedient to one parent, and, perhaps, encouraged in his faults by the other, or of a rebellious and dissolute daughter, or of, perhaps, the most common case of all, when a son has been corrupted by the example of vicious parents, or ruined by the mismanagement of weak ones;] and the elders of the city must decide the cause. The prosecution could not be admitted but for stubbornness and rebellion, connected with gluttony and drunkenness, and persisted in after rebukes and corrections; and these vices tended directly to ruin families and communities. [How much more the vices or weaknesses of the parents, who had brought up such a child to the injury of the State!] The offender must be convicted and proved incorrigible, by evidence sufficient to induce the judges to denounce the sentence, and the men of the city to execute it. [There is nothing to indicate that any evidence was needed beside the simple assertion of the parents.] Natural affection would seldom be so overcome even by the basest crimes, as to admit both parents thus to join in prosecuting a son, much less to do so without sufficient cause. And, in the very few instances, in which hasty rage, or implacable resentment, might induce parents to attempt such a horrid unnatural murder, as a needless prosecution must imply, the most effectual precautions were taken to prevent the consequences. [Where is there any sign of such ‘precautions’?] The execution of the law must, of course, very seldom take place; and, if ever it did, it could not fail to excite general attention and alarm, and prove a salutary warning to tens of thousands. Its very existence, *as far as known*, would exceedingly strengthen the authority of parents, give weight to their commands, reproofs, and corrections, and create an additional fear of provoking their deep resentment. It would fortify young men against the enticement of bad companions, and the force of strong temptations, and thus check the progress of wickedness. Moreover, it would be a constant admonition to parents to watch over their children, and not improperly to indulge them or withhold correction, but to establish their authority over them while young, to pray for them, to check the first buddings of vice, and to set them a good example. [It is difficult to see how such a law as this could tend to produce this effect on the parents. A law to punish them, for the misconduct of their children of either sex, might in many cases have been at once more just and more beneficial.] This statute, therefore, so harmless and beneficial in its operations, yet so contrary to human policy [and the laws of natural affection], rather *proves* [!] than *invalidates* the Divine authority of the book in which it stands recorded. No impostor would ever have thought of enacting such a law.

739. As before observed, there is no reason to suppose that the above law,

though *imagined* by the Deuteronomist, was ever really meant to be acted on. It was, as SCOTT says, very 'harmless' in its operations, as regards any actual execution of its injunctions. But it may be that the writer intended to teach a great lesson to the people of his time and of all times, by thus insisting on the paramount dignity of the parental authority. Besides the fact that, in a profligate age, 'disobedience to parents' is sure to be one of the prominent signs of the general corruption, Rom. i. 30, the guilt of which attaches as much to the parents themselves as to the children, the Deuteronomist may have had a special purpose in marking *this sin* as deserving condign punishment, inasmuch as it shadowed forth the crying sins of the people of his time in their relations to Almighty God.

740. Accordingly, we find *Jeremiah* continually appealing to the Fatherhood of Jehovah, and condemning in the strongest terms the disobedience of His Children, the people of Israel. Thus he complains of their—

'saying to a stock, Thou art my Father, to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth,' ii. 27.

And he writes:—

'Wilt thou not from this time cry unto me, My Father, Thou art the Guide of my youth?' iii. 4.

'And I said, Thou shalt call me, My Father, and shalt not turn away from me,' iii. 19.

'I am a Father to Israel, and Ephraim is my first-born,' xxxi. 9.

And in ch. xxxv he compares the obedience of the sons of 'Jonadab, the son of Rechab,' with the stubborn and unruly conduct of his own children; comp. also xxxi. 18-20.

In this view of the case, the words of D. xxi. 21 would have a great significance,—

'and all Israel shall hear and fear.'

CHAPTER XVI.

DEUT. XXIII. 1-XXVI. 19.

741. D. xxiii. 1, 2.

Superstitious rules like these, *e.g.*—

'A bastard shall not enter into the congregation of Jehovah: even to his tenth generation shall he not enter into the congregation of Jehovah,'—

(the like to which have even been re-

peated in the Christian Church,) cannot certainly be ascribed without irreverence to the Gracious God and Father of all. Especially, the exclusion of a 'bastard' to the tenth generation from the privileges of the Sanctuary, while the *father*, the guilty cause of his child's illegitimate birth, was not excluded, and when children by a concubine,—by one, perhaps, of many belonging to the same man,—had also free access to the sacred place,—seems, to our modern sense of right and equity, most unjust.

742. This law was evidently designed to act as a check to some extent on promiscuous fornication and adulterous connections, while polygamy and concubinage were allowed. But its action would have been directly opposed to the principles of Divine government, as announced by Ezekiel, xviii. 20, and, indeed, by the Deuteronomist himself in another place, xxiv. 16,—

'The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin;'

whereas this law punished the child and his descendants for centuries for the sin of the parent.

743. D. xxiii. 3.

'An Ammonite or Moabite shall not enter into the congregation of Jehovah.'

The 'Ammonite' and 'Moabite' are mentioned here, in connection with the 'bastard,' &c. with manifest reference to the story of the incestuous origin of Moab and Ammon in G. xix. 30-38; and these, too, are to be excluded from the 'congregation of Jehovah' unto their tenth generation, v. 3. There is, doubtless, here a reference also to the inveterate enmity which existed between these nations and Israel in the writer's own time.

744. We have already quoted passages (584, 586), which show that both the Moabites and Ammonites were independent and powerful communities in the days of *Jeremiah*; and in 2K. xxiv. 2 bands of each nation are spoken of as harassing Judah, together with the Chaldees and Syrians, shortly after the death of Josiah. We may infer that both these kindred peoples entertained

the same spirit of hostility towards the people of Jehovah, which we find expressly ascribed to Moab in Jer. xlviii. 26, 27, 42 :—

'Make ye him drunken, for he magnified himself against Jehovah; Moab also shall wallow in his vomit, and he also shall be in derision. For was not Israel a derision unto thee? . . . Moab shall be destroyed from being a people, because he hath magnified himself against Jehovah.'

It may be with reference to this permanent state of ill-feeling, which existed between Israel and these two nations, that the Deuteronomist charges the Israelites with respect to them, v. 6—

'Thou shalt not seek their peace nor their prosperity all thy days for ever.'

745. D. xxiii. 7, 8.

'Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite; for he is thy brother. Thou shalt not abhor an Egyptian; because thou wast a stranger in his land.'

The singular reason here given for 'not abhorring the Egyptian,' after all the afflictions which the people had suffered in the 'iron furnace,' the 'house of bondage,'—*viz.* 'because thou wast a stranger in his land,'—points, probably, as we have said (712), to some close connection with Egypt in the days of the Deuteronomist. Josiah himself was killed by Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, 2K. xxiii. 29. But it is very probable that, in the earlier part of his reign of 31 years, there was a much better feeling between Judah and Egypt.

746. In the time of his grandfather Hezekiah there must have been an alliance between them; since Rabshakeh says, 2K. xviii. 21,—

'Now, behold, thou trustest upon the staff of this broken reed, even upon Egypt.'

And though the Prophet Isaiah did not approve of this connection, yet there was evidently a great deal of friendliness between the two peoples in his days. Thus he writes :—

'Woe to the rebellious children . . . that walk to go down into Egypt, and have not asked at my mouth, to strengthen themselves in the strength of Pharaoh, and to trust in the shadow of Egypt. . . . For the Egyptians shall help in vain, and to no purpose.' Is. xxxi. 1, 2, 7.

'Woe to them that go down to Egypt for help. . . . Now the Egyptians are men, and not God, and their horses flesh, and not spirit.' Is. xxxi. 1, 3.

And, as observed above (712), the language of Jeremiah in ii. 18, 36, implies that in the early part of his reign Josiah expected friendly help from Egypt :—

'What hast thou to do in the way of Egypt, to drink the waters of Sihor? . . . Thou also shalt be ashamed of Egypt, as thou wast ashamed of Assyria.'

747. Egypt also was a place of refuge for many Jewish fugitives after the destruction of Jerusalem, in spite of the strong remonstrances of the Prophet, whom they carried with them, Jer. xliii. 6, 7. The reason for his opposition to this movement was, evidently, the certainty which he felt that the people would there give themselves up to gross idolatry, as, in fact, they did, Jer. xlii. 7, 8 :—

'Wherefore commit ye this great evil against your souls, to cut off from you man and woman, child and suckling, out of Judah, to leave you none to remain; in that ye provoke me unto wrath with the works of your hands, burning incense unto other gods in the land of Egypt, whither ye be gone to dwell?'

748. Of Judah's relations with Edom we know nothing from the history, in the reigns of Hezekiah, Manasseh, Amon, and Josiah. In the days of Ahaz, Hezekiah's father, the Edomites had come, and smitten Judah, and carried away captives, according to the Chronicler, 2Ch. xxviii. 17. There may have been peace with them afterwards,—at all events, at the time when the Deuteronomist was writing; and, indeed, we hear nothing of their troubling Judah any further, till they seem to have triumphed at the Fall of Jerusalem, Lam. iv. 21, Ob. 10—14.

749. D. xxiii. 17, 18.

'There shall be no whore of the daughters of Israel, nor a sodomite of the sons of Israel. Thou shalt not bring the hire of a whore, or the price of a dog (= 'reward of sodomy'), unto the House of Jehovah thy God for any vow: for even both these are abomination unto Jehovah thy God.'

The words which are here translated 'sodomite' and 'whore,' mean literally 'consecrated.' It appears, therefore, that the practice, which prevailed among the Aramean tribes, of maidens and boys prostituting themselves in honour of their deities, existed also in the writer's time among the Hebrews, and was not

thought incompatible with the worship of Jehovah.

750. This no doubt arose from the idolatrous worship of Jehovah which was carried on in the 'high places;' and it accounts for the energy with which the Deuteronomist declares himself against them, and the strong effort he makes to abolish them throughout the land. Reference is most probably made to these vicious practices in the account of the sins of Israel, committed with the 'daughters of Moab' in N.xxv. But the older legislation, apparently, did not find it necessary to forbid these abominations, which were the growth of a more advanced state of corrupt civilisation.

751. D.xxiii.20.

'Unto a stranger thou mayest lend upon usury: but unto thy brother thou shalt not lend upon usury.'

The law against usury, as laid down by the older writer in E.xxii.25-27, is here qualified in a way which indicates the growth of *commercial intercourse* in the writer's time.

752. D.xxiv.8,9.

'Take heed in the plague of leprosy that thou observe diligently, and do according to all that the Priests the Levites shall teach you; as I commanded them, so ye shall observe to do. Remember what Jehovah thy God did unto Miriam by the way, after that ye were come forth out of Egypt.'

This is the only *direct* reference to the older statute-book, which we find in Deuteronomy: and here we have no longer the usual phrase, 'as I command thee this day.' It is plain from the above that the older document, with its laws about leprosy, &c., *did* remain, as we have supposed, in the keeping of the Priests, in a book that was 'before the Priests the Levites,' D.xvii. 18, and served as a kind of directory for their proceedings in all matters of this kind, and as a record from which they might instruct the people. This is in accordance with the words of the old Law, L.x.11, addressed to the Priests—

'And that ye may teach the children of Israel all the statutes which Jehovah hath spoken unto them by the hand of Moses.'

And this explains also the allusions in the Prophets to the Priests being the professed teachers of the Law. *e.g.*—

'The Law shall not perish from the Priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the Prophet,' Jer.xviii.18;

'And they shall teach my people (the difference) between the holy and profane, and cause them to discern between the unclean and the clean,' Ez.xliv.23;

and see also Hag.ii.11-13, Mal.ii.7.

753. D.xxv.5-10.

This law, that a brother must take to wife his dead brother's widow, must in all cases, where the surviving brother was already married, not only have permitted and sanctioned, but actually encouraged, nay, even enjoined, polygamy, under the penalty of a lasting disgrace attaching to the man who refused to take this additional wife,—not to speak of the consequences of his disregarding a (supposed) Divine command. Even if unmarried, it would have been a great hardship to have had his brother's widow forced upon him, as his *only* companion for life. It cannot be supposed that such a man would generally have been content with her alone, especially as polygamy was permitted. She might be old, ill-favoured, ill-tempered, sickly; and his dead brother might have left him more wives than one to be taken in this way. All these inconveniences are actually experienced among the Zulus and other South African tribes, where the same practice prevails.

754. D.xxv.17-19.

We have here the command enforced upon Israel—

Thou shalt blot out the remembrance of Amalek from under heaven; thou shalt not forget it.'

We hear nothing of the Amalekites in the history of the later kings. But in Ps.lxxxiii.7, written apparently in David's time, we find mention made of Amalek, as joined with the other neighbouring nations, Edom, Moab, Ammon, the Philistines, and the Syrians, in a grand confederacy against Israel. They may have survived as a people down to the days of the Deuteronomist, though, perhaps, they existed in his time as a small and inconsiderable tribe, dwindling away to nothing.

755. D.xxvi.12-15. Upon this passage see (649-652).

It can scarcely be supposed that this

diffuse formula was ever really intended to be used. It was meant most probably to remind the pious Israelite of his duty towards the poor and the Levite; and, as before noticed, the stress is here distinctly laid upon the due employment in works of charity of the tithe of the *third* year, 'the year of tithing,' which was to be spent at home in general feasting, to which, besides all the members of the family, the needy and destitute of all kinds were to be invited. It seems as if the writer *did* hope that this law with respect to the tithes might be carried out, whatever might be the case with the others.

CHAPTER XVII.

DEUT. XXVII. 1-26.

756. D. xxvii. 1-8.

'And Moses, with the elders of Israel, commanded the people, saying, Keep all the commandments, which I command you this day. And it shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan into the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, that thou shalt set thee up great stones, and plaster them with plaster. And thou shalt write upon them all the words of this Law, when thou art passed over, that thou mayest go in unto the land, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, a *land that floweth with milk and honey*, as Jehovah, the God of thy fathers, hath promised thee. Therefore it shall be, when ye be gone over Jordan, that ye shall set up these stones, which I command you this day, in *Mount Ebal*, [Sam. 'Gerizim,' LXX. 'Ebal'], and thou shalt plaster them with plaster. And there shalt thou build an altar unto Jehovah thy God, an altar of stones; thou shalt not lift up any iron tool upon them. Thou shalt build the altar of Jehovah thy God of whole stones; and thou shalt offer burnt-offerings thereon unto Jehovah thy God; and thou shalt offer peace-offerings, and shalt eat there, and rejoice before Jehovah thy God. *And thou shalt write upon the stones all the words of this Law very plainly.*'

The Samaritan Pentateuch has a remarkable addition after E. xx. 17, that is to say, immediately after the Ten Commandments. It introduces here a passage which is almost identically the same with D. xxvii. 2-8, except that it has *Mount Gerizim* as the place, where the stones of the Law were to be set up, instead of *Mount Ebal*.

757. The following are the particulars, more precisely, in which the passage in Deuteronomy differs from that in the Samaritan Pentateuch after E. xx. 17:—

(i) In v. 2, for 'It shall be when Jehovah thy God shall bring thee into the land of the Canaanites, whither thou goest to possess it,' the Deuteronomist writes, 'It shall be on the day when ye shall pass over Jordan unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee.'

(ii) In v. 3, after 'the words of this Law,' he has added, 'when thou art passed over, that thou mayest go in unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, a *land that floweth with milk and honey*, as Jehovah thy God hath promised thee.'

(iii) In v. 4, he has changed 'Mount Gerizim' into 'Mount Ebal,' and repeated superfluously the command, 'Thou shalt plaster them with plaster,' already given in v. 2.

(iv) He has omitted the last sentence of the Samaritan passage, and inserted it, slightly modified, in D. xi. 30.

758. Upon this point, KENNICOTT writes as follows, *Diss. i. p. 96*:

It must have appeared strange, surprisingly strange, during the reader's perusal of the preceding remarks, that it is not more clearly expressed *what* this Law, thus to be engraved, *was*,—that a point of so much importance should not have been, somewhere or other, very accurately noted, and very particularly circumscribed by Moses, partly for the more secure direction of Joshua, and partly to render this awful transaction more intelligible through future ages. But all this surprise ceases—all this puzzle is unravelled—all this uncertainty is at once removed—if we allow the authority of the Samaritan Pentateuch, if we will but grant that there may have been in the Hebrew text a certain passage, which is now found in all the copies of the Samaritan Text and Version, and which is also found, exactly as in the Samaritan Pentateuch, in that Arabic version of it, in the Arabic character, which has been before mentioned, and which is a very valuable, because a very literal, version. For in E. xx, as soon as the Tenth Commandment is concluded, we read in the Samaritan Pentateuch the five following verses—'And it shall be, &c.'

Here, then, according to this truly venerable copy of the Book of Moses, all is clear. The whole is perfectly regular, and in harmonious proportion. We have seen the several circumstances, concurring to render it highly probable that the Ten Commandments constituted the Law, which was to be engraved. And, as it can scarcely be conceived that such a point could have been quite omitted by Moses, it makes greatly for the honour of the Samaritan Pentateuch, to have preserved so considerable a passage. *Why* the ancient Jews should omit this passage, can be a matter of no doubt at all with those, who mark the honour it does to Mount Gerizim. And, therefore, the same men who corrupted D. xxvii. 4, have but acted with uniformity, if they have also corrupted E. xx, omitting Gerizim in the latter instance, just as honestly as they altered it in the former.

That the Samaritan Text should be condemned as corrupted *merely* for having more in it than the Hebrew, no man of learning will maintain. Certainly, the Jews *might* omit,

as easily as the Samaritans *might insert*. And I presume that it has been, and will be hereafter more fully, proved, that several whole passages, now in the Samaritan, but not in the Hebrew Pentateuch, are not interpolations in the former, but omissions in the latter.

759. In addition to the above remarks of KENNICOTT we may observe:—

(i) If the Samaritans *introduced* the passage after E.xx.17, in order to do special honour to their sacred Mount Gerizim, they must have copied it from the passage in Deuteronomy already existing, only changing Ebal into Gerizim.

(ii) But in that case they would not surely have omitted the very characteristic expression, 'a land that floweth with milk and honey,' which occurs in the latter, v.3.

(iii) There was a reason why, *after* the Captivity, when such hostility existed between the Jews and Samaritans, and the latter had built their opposition Temple on Mount Gerizim, the *Jews* should have corrupted the Text of these Scriptures, as KENNICOTT supposes.

(iv) But there was no reason why any Jewish writer, living in any age *before* the Captivity, should not have chosen the splendid Table-Mountain of Gerizim (323), in the very centre of the land of Canaan, and visible afar off, as the site on which the stones should be set up, containing the record of God's covenant with Israel, in sight, as it were, of all the people of the land.

(v) And we actually find Gerizim chosen by the Deuteronomist himself (763), as the Mount of *Blessing*, xxvii. 12, on which Joshua himself was to take his stand, with the principal tribes of Levi, Judah, Joseph, and Benjamin; whereas Ebal was to be the Mount of *Cursing*, v.13, on which the inferior tribes were to be stationed.

760. There seems, therefore, every reason to believe that KENNICOTT's suggestion is well-founded, *viz.* that—

(i) The passage D.xxvii.2-8 has been copied by the Deuteronomist from the passage which stood originally in the Hebrew MS. after E.xx.17;

(ii) He has inserted in it the phrase 'a land that floweth with milk and honey,' which is one of his favourite

phrases, vi. 3, xi. 9, xxvi. 9, 15, xxvii. 3, xxxi. 20;

(iii) The later Jews have altered in v.4 the name Gerizim, which the Deuteronomist wrote, into Ebal, and have struck out also altogether the original passage after E.xx.17.

761. Hence we can explain the origin of the expression 'all the words of this Law,' v.3,8, which in the context, in which they now stand, can only, as KNOBEL says, be referred—

not to the 'blessings and curses,' nor to the 'law of Deuteronomy' only, but to the whole Mosaic Law, though the writer means only the actual prescriptions of the Law,—according to the Jews, 613 in number,—and not, at the same time, all narratives, warnings, admonitions, speeches, reasonings, &c.

But to engrave on stones even the 'blessings and curses,' if by this is meant the matter in D.xxvii.15-xxviii. 68, would have required an immense amount of labour and material,—much more the whole Law of Deuteronomy, or the 613 precepts.

762. Applied, however, as the direction appears to have been in its original position, only to the 'Ten Commandments,' the 'ten words,' E.xxxiv.28, which are expressly 'called the Law, E.xxiv.12, (not 'a Law,' E.V.), the phrase 'all the words of this Law' is quite intelligible. The Deuteronomist appears to have transferred the direction from the end of the Ten Commandments to the end of (what may be considered to be) his *expansion* of the Ten Commandments, v.1-xxvi.19, without observing that in that connection it was incongruous and impracticable, as, in fact, he never really contemplated its being actually carried out.

763. D.xxvii.11-26.

'And Moses charged the people the same day, saying, These shall stand upon Mount Gerizim to bless the people, when ye are come over Jordan,—Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Joseph, and Benjamin; and these shall stand upon Mount Ebal to curse,—Reuben, Gad, and Asher, and Zebulun, Dan, and Naphtali. And the *Levites* shall speak, and say unto all the men of Israel with a loud voice, Cursed be the man, &c. And all the people shall answer and say, Amen.'

It is not easy to see what is the exact meaning of the above direction, as it now stands. Six tribes are to *bless*,

and six to *curse*, and among the *former* is placed the tribe of *Levi*; then, afterwards, the *Levites*, who should be standing with the other five *blessing* tribes, are to pronounce the *curses*, and all the people are to 'say, Amen.' It is true, these 'Levites' are most probably the 'Priests,' whom we find so continually mentioned as 'Levites' in Deuteronomy; and, as the whole passage appears to be due to one hand, we may suppose that the whole *tribe* of *Levi* was to stand on Gerizim to bless, while the small body of *Priests* were to take their place, perhaps, in such a position as to command both parties, and 'give out' the words both of blessing and of cursing.

764. Still it seems strange that the *same* writer should have left such a confusion in his story as now exists, setting the '*tribe of Levi*' to *bless*, in *v.12*, and the '*Levites*' to pronounce the *curse*, in *v.14*, without any kind of explanation. Nor is there any indication whatever of the original direction being carried out, of six tribes blessing and six cursing. And the '*blessings*' which follow in *xxviii.3-6* are not given at all in the same way as the curses. In fact, *ch.xxviii* begins abruptly, in such a manner, that it is impossible to say from the *context* who is supposed to be speaking, though from the *contents* we may infer that it is Moses.

765. We may suppose, however, as we have said, that the writer means the whole body of the tribe of *Levi* to stand with the other five tribes on the Mount of Blessing, while the *Levites proper*, or *Priests*, were to stand by the Ark in some central position,—at one end, it may be, of the long narrow valley which parted the two mountains, on the slopes of which the twelve tribes were to be stationed. This would agree with the description in *Jo.viii.33*:—

'And all Israel, and their elders and officers, and their judges, stood on this side the Ark and on that side, before the *Priests* the *Levites*, which bare the Ark of the covenant of Jehovah. . . . half of them over against Mount Gerizim, and half of them over against Mount Ebal.'

This agrees, too, with the fact that the Deuteronomist speaks of Joseph as a single tribe in *xxxiii.13*, and it seems

to be confirmed by the expressions in *xviii.6-8*, already considered (720), which imply that, according to his view, only *some* of the tribe of *Levi* would be likely to enter upon the sacred office.

766. Still the difficulty remains to conceive in what way the Deuteronomist meant this '*blessing*' and '*cursing*' to be conducted. I must confess that I cannot explain the matter in any way satisfactorily, or without some extravagant assumption as to what the writer has omitted to state. It may be suggested, for instance, that in *v.14* it should be translated,—

'And the *Levites* shall answer, and say unto all the men of Israel with a loud voice;—

as if they were first to hear the curses from the party on Mount Ebal, and then to repeat them to the whole community. But then there is no explanation of the way in which the '*blessings*' were to be delivered. And it is plain that *ch.xxviii* passes away altogether from any formal utterance of the blessings like that of the curses, and shapes itself into a solemn address of the Lawgiver, abruptly begun without any introduction.

767. Upon the whole, it appears to me to be most probable that the writer has departed from his original intention. In *xi.29* he meant the *tribes* to pronounce the blessings and curses, and made the arrangement for that purpose in *xxvii.11-13*. But he then decided to place them in the mouths of the *Priests*, and make the people say, 'Amen;': and this he actually did with the curses. Instead of limiting himself in this way, however, with respect to the blessings, he has insensibly been carried away by his subject, and poured out his full heart in the glowing and vehement words of *ch.xxviii*. This chapter he has now left without any introduction or explanation, without any intimation of its connection with the matter before or after. He may have intended that the *Levites* should be made to utter a series of short blessings, like the curses, such as those in *xxviii.3-6*, which correspond almost exactly to the curses in *v.16-19*, so that these cannot be themselves the bless-

ings intended in xxvii.13. But, if so, he was presently overpowered by his own intensity of feeling, and has thus left us the magnificent language of this chapter, in which blessings and cursings, both of the strongest kind, are mixed up together.

768. As it is plain that this whole transaction is only an ideal scene, which the author himself, apparently, has not even realised completely in his own imagination, it is hardly necessary to consider at any length the question of the physical possibility of such blessings and curses being uttered in this way, so as to be heard by the people and duly responded to. The length of the valley between the two mountains is said to be about three miles, and its breadth from 200 to 300 yards.

769. Dean STANLEY writes, *Sinai and Palestine*, p.237,—

High above the fertile vale [of Shechem] rose the long rocky ridge of Mount Gerizim, facing the equally long and rocky range of Ebal;—

and he quotes also JEROME's statement with respect to the two mountains,—

They are a considerable distance apart; nor would the sounds of persons blessing or cursing in turns be heard from one to the other.

JEROME, accordingly, wishes to select two other mountains near Jericho. But, as Dean STANLEY observes,—

The positive statement, that the mountains were by the terebinths of Moreh, D.xi.30, compels us to adhere to the common view. . . . The ceremony may have taken place on the lower spurs of the mountains, where they approach more nearly to each other. And I am informed that even from the two summits shepherds have been heard conversing with each other.

770. Doubtless, in peculiar states of the air, as when, perhaps, on a calm and still evening, the dews are beginning to fall, shepherds may be able to hear and answer one another, and even to maintain, by special effort, a conversation at considerable distances, as the natives of Australia and Natal now do. But can such an exertion of the voice be thought of in connection with such a solemn ceremony as this? In this particular case, there is no possibility of evading the full meaning of the expression 'the whole congregation,' as implying the great body, at all

events, of the 600,000 warriors, and of substituting for them the 'elders,' since in Jo.viii.33, just quoted, where the transaction in question is described, we are told that—

'All Israel, and their elders and officers, and their judges, stood on this side the Ark and on that side, before the Priests the Levites, the bearers of [E.V. 'which bare'] the Ark of the covenant of Jehovah, as well the stranger as he that was born among them; half of them over against Mount Gerizim, and half of them over against Mount Ebal; as Moses the servant of Jehovah had commanded before, that they should bless the people of Israel.'

771. This immense host, surely, though posted (as Dean STANLEY supposes) 'on the lower spurs of the mountains,' would have stretched along, we must suppose, for miles. It is common, however, to suppose a magnificent scene, where the people would be standing as above, and the 'curses' in v.15-26 would be repeated by the Levites, and heard by those standing nearest to them. These might then begin the 'Amen,' which would be swelled by the tremendous thunder of the 'whole congregation,' who need not be supposed to have heard the words, as they knew them beforehand. But what are the 'blessings,' to which special reference is made in the above quotation, as well as in D.xxvii.12?

CHAPTER XVIII.

DEUT.XXVIII.1-XXXI.30.

*772. D.xxviii.1-68.

This grand chapter appears to have been written by one who had already the ruin of the Ten Tribes before him, and who foreboded the same terrible calamity for Judah also, if it persisted in its idolatry and wickedness. The nation of 'fierce countenance and strange tongue from afar,' v.49,50, was either the Assyrian, if he wrote in the days of Hezekiah, or the Chaldee, if he wrote, as seems most probable, in the days of Josiah. It will be seen, as we proceed, that many of the expressions here used are used also by Jeremiah in his prophecies with reference to the Chaldeans. Thus the 'yoke of iron,' v.48, appears in Jer.xxviii.14,—the 'nation from afar,' v.49, in Jer.v.15,—'as the

eagle flieth,' v.49, in Jer.xlviii.40, xlix. 22, comp. iv.13, Lam.iv.19; and v.53—

'Thou shalt eat . . . the flesh of thy sons and of thy daughters . . . in the siege and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee;—

is repeated in Jer.xix.9—

'I will make them eat the flesh of their sons and the flesh of their daughters . . . in the siege and in the straitness wherewith their enemies shall distress them.'

773. According to the Chronicler, 2Ch.xxxiii.11, Josiah's father, Manasseh, was actually carried captive to Babylon; but this is not mentioned in the more authentic history. However, this prediction that, if they continued in their sins, the whole people with their king, v.36, would suffer at the hand of the Chaldeans the same fate as their brethren of the Ten Tribes had experienced from the Assyrians, was written, no doubt, with reference to the king then reigning, probably Manasseh, Amon, or Josiah in his early years.

774. D.xxviii.36.

'Jehovah shall bring thee, and thy king which thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation which neither thou nor thy fathers have known.'

Here the writer, as in xvii.14-20, represents Moses as assuming that they will 'set over' themselves 'a king' in later days, and referring to such a proceeding as a very natural one, instead of speaking of it as a 'rejection of Jehovah,' IS.viii.7, a 'great wickedness,' xii.17. RIEHM observes, very justly:—

The writer here—very probably, at least—sets forth the kingdom as already existing. For how should Moses have come to think of this, viz. that, while seeking to stimulate the people of *his own time*, (to whom, of course, his discourse is primarily addressed,) through threatenings of punishment, to a closer observance of the Law, he should threaten with evil a king who was first to be set over them in a far later time?

775. D.xxviii.68.

'And Jehovah shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships, by the way whereof I spake unto thee, Thou shalt see it no more again: and there ye shall be sold unto your enemies for bondmen and bondwomen, and no man shall buy you.'

By these 'ships,' the writer may have meant either the *Phanician* merchant-ships,—which would carry off the Hebrew slaves, purchased from the Chal-

dæans to sell them in different countries, Joel iii.4-8, Am.i.6,9, Ez.xxvii.13, and, among others, in Egypt, where they would be bondmen a second time to the Egyptians,—or, more probably, the famous *Egyptian* fleets of Pharaoh-Necho, HEROD.ii.159. It is not necessarily implied that there were already hostile relations with Egypt, or that danger was to be immediately dreaded from that quarter.

776. On the contrary, (745-747) the Deuteronomist recognises a certain amount of friendliness on the part of the Egyptians towards Israel at the time of his writing, as he does also on the part of the Edomites. But this state of amicable relation might at any moment be disturbed; and so, in fact, we find that Josiah himself was killed by Pharaoh-Necho, 2K.xxiii.29, and his son Jehoahaz, after a reign of three months, was 'put in bands' by the King of Egypt, 'that he might not reign in Jerusalem;' and 'he put the land to a tribute of an hundred talents of silver,' and he 'took Jehoahaz away,' and he came to Egypt, and died there.'

777. D.xxix.4-8.

'Yet Jehovah hath not given you an heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear unto this day. And I have led you forty years in the wilderness [see D.viii.2]: your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot. Ye have not eaten bread, neither have ye drunk wine or strong drink; that ye might know that I am Jehovah your God. And when ye came unto this place, Sihon the king of Heshbon, and Og the king of Bashan, came out against us unto battle, and we smote them, and we took their land, and gave it for an inheritance unto the Reubenites, and to the Gadites, and to the half tribe of Manasseh.'

It is obvious that the writer has here inadvertently slid from speaking in the character of *Moses* in v.4, to speaking in that of Jehovah in v.5,6, and has again returned to that of Moses in v.7,8. We have a similar and yet more noticeable instance (627) in xi.14,15. The LXX appear to have perceived, and avoided, *this* difficulty in both these passages, by changing *I* into *He*.

778. D.xxix.10,11.

'Ye stand this day all of you before Jehovah your God; your captains of your tribes, your elders, and your officers, all the men of Israel, your families (E.V. 'little ones') your wives, and thy stranger that is in thy camp,

from the bower of thy wood unto the drawer of thy water.'

Manifestly, the whole assembled host of two or three millions is here described as present before Moses at one time. If words have any meaning, surely this is what is meant here, and, therefore, as we may reasonably believe, in the other places also, where Moses and Joshua are spoken of as addressing 'all Israel' at one time.

*779. D. xxix. 24-29.

'Even all nations shall say, Wherefore hath Jehovah done thus unto this land? What meaneth the heat of this great anger? Then men shall say, Because they have forsaken the covenant of Jehovah, the God of their fathers, which he made with them when he brought them forth out of the land of Egypt. For they went and served other gods, and worshipped them, gods whom they knew not, and whom He had not given unto them. And the anger of Jehovah was kindled against this land, to bring upon it all the curses that are written in this Book. And Jehovah rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land, as it is this day. The secret things belong unto Jehovah our God: but those things which are revealed belong unto us and to our children for ever, that we may do all the words of this law.'

In this way the writer would have the people of Judah, in his own time, look back upon the desolated kingdom of Israel. They had been grievously chastened for their sins, and cast into another land, 'as it is this day,' for an example to their brethren of the kingdom of Judah, lest they also should provoke the righteous anger of Jehovah, and come at last to suffer the same terrible visitation.

780. What mercy, indeed, might yet be in store, even for the afflicted Ten Tribes, the Prophet knows not, though there are expressions in this Book which imply that he had still great hopes for them in their latter end, if only they would repent and return to the stronghold of their Hope, *e.g.* xxx. 1-9:—

'And it shall come to pass,—when all these things are come upon thee, the blessing and the curse, which I have set before thee, and thou shalt call them to mind among all the nations, whither Jehovah thy God hath driven thee, and shalt return unto Jehovah thy God, and shalt obey His Voice according to all that I command thee this day, thou and thy children, with all thine heart and with all thy soul,—that then Jehovah thy God will turn thy captivity, and have compassion upon thee, and will return and gather thee from all the

nations, whither Jehovah thy God hath scattered thee. . . . And Jehovah thy God will bring thee into the land which thy fathers possessed, and thou shalt possess it, and He will do thee good, and multiply thee above thy fathers. . . . And Jehovah thy God will make thee plenteous in every work of thine hand, in the fruit of thy body, and in the fruit of thy cattle, and in the fruit of thy land, for good; for Jehovah will again rejoice over thee for good, as He rejoiced over thy fathers.'

781. But these 'secret things belong unto Jehovah' xxix. 29; He will know what to do in His own good time for the restoration of His people. Meanwhile 'those things which are revealed,'—the manifest signs, which we have had before us, of God's righteous judgment upon His sinful children,—'belong unto us and to our children for ever,' that we may lay them to heart with all earnestness, and 'do all the words of this Law.'

Such seems to be the strain of the Prophet's address contained in this passage.

*782. D. xxix. 28.

'And Jehovah rooted them out of their land in anger, and in wrath, and in great indignation, and cast them into another land, *as it is this day.*'

Upon which Scott observes—

Probably, the clause 'as it is this day' was added by Ezra, or by some scribe, who had witnessed the desolations of the Babylonish Captivity. But the emphasis of it, as the acknowledgment of the accomplishment of this ancient prophecy, supposing the words 'as it is this day' to be spoken by a modern Jew, after the long-continued dispersion of the nation, is inconceivably enhanced.

The words, as we believe, were written by one, who had before him the actual desolation of the Ten Tribes, who were carried away captive B.C. 721, and may very well have been described in Josiah's reign, about B.C. 630, some eighty or ninety years afterwards, as having been 'cast into another land, as it is this day.' This expression could not have been employed so naturally at a much earlier time,—for instance, by one writing in Hezekiah's reign, B.C. 727-698, in the sixth year of which the Captivity in question took place.

783. D. xxxi. 1-9.

KNOBEL observes here, p. 319:—

This section [and v. 10-13,] is purely Deuteronomistic matter, as we perceive by its relation to what precedes, and by its whole expression. But the statement in v. 2, [where Moses

is made to say, 'I am an hundred and twenty years old this day, *I can no more go out and come in,*' does not agree with that in xxxiv. 7, [where we read, 'Moses was an hundred and twenty years old when he died; *his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.*']

We shall find (862) that this latter passage is a fragment of the older document, from which the Deuteronomist has borrowed the datum as to the age of Moses, though he has not adhered to the rest of the statement, as to his still retaining his eye-sight and vigour to the last.

784. D. xxxi. 9.

'And Moses wrote this Law, and delivered it unto the *Priests* the sons of Levi, the bearers of the Ark (E.V. 'which bare the Ark') of the covenant of Jehovah, and unto all the elders of Israel.'

The Hebrew participle in the above implies the *habitual practice* of the Priests in bearing the Ark, not that they bore it merely on the present occasion, as the rendering of the E.V. might be supposed to imply. When, however, the same author writes again, on the very same occasion, v. 25, —

'Then Moses commanded the *Levites*, the bearers of the Ark; —

he does not really contradict *himself*, though he does contradict the language of the other books of the Pentateuch. For his 'Levites,' v. 25, as we have seen, are Priests, 'the Priests the Levites,' v. 9, who, according to him, were the regular Ark-bearers, instead of the common Levites, 'the sons of Kohath,' to whom the duty of carrying it is assigned in the Book of Numbers, iv. 15, vii. 9, x. 21.

785. As to this 'Book of the Law,' SCOTT observes: —

'Some understand this of the Book of Deuteronomy alone. But it is far more reasonable to conclude that the whole Law was delivered to the Priests and Elders, a copy perhaps to the principal person in each tribe, besides one to be deposited in the side of [beside] the Ark. It may be supposed that afterwards many more copies would be taken, though they would not be greatly multiplied in that infancy, as it were, of writing.

There is, however, no sign that any such copies were taken, nor any indication that the 'whole Law' was known to David and the best kings of Israel, who habitually, and, in their most earnest and pious days, transgressed so

thoroughly its plain commandments. The writer, probably, referred to the Book of Deuteronomy, as 'this Law'; for by this expression he repeatedly distinguishes it from that part of the Law contained in the other books, e.g. —

'On this side Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare *this Law*,' i. 5;

'*This Law*, which I set before you this day,' iv. 8;

'And *this is the Law*, which Moses set before the children of Israel. . . on this side Jordan, &c.,' iv. 44-46.

786. Moses is here spoken of as first 'writing this Law, and delivering it' unto the Priests and Elders, v. 9, and even commanding the Levites to 'put it beside the Ark,' v. 26; and still continuing to write on, as in ch. xxxii, xxxiii. Hence some, who maintain the Mosaic origin of Deuteronomy, allow that these chapters, at least, must have been inserted into the book by a later hand, or else suggest that Moses must have taken it back again for the purpose of making these additions to it, or that the 'delivering it' to the Priests in v. 9 may have been merely a 'symbolical' action, and that he immediately resumed possession of it again.

787. But then we find him in still earlier passages *speaking* of the book as already existing, before he had finished the addresses, of which it is mainly composed, and, of course, before he, or any one else, could have *written* them; e.g. —

'If thou wilt not observe to do all the words of this Law, that are written in this Book,' xxviii. 58;

'Every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the Book of this Law,' v. 61;

'All the curses that are written in this Book,' xxix. 20, 21, 27;

and in xvii. 18 the king is ordered to — 'write him a copy of this Law in a book, out of that which is before the Priests the Levites.'

All these are obvious indications of the later origin of the Book of Deuteronomy, and of the unhistorical character of the addresses recorded in it.

788. D. xxxi. 10-13.

'And Moses commanded them, saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before Jehovah thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this Law before all Israel in their hearing.'

There is no indication in the history

that this command was ever carried out till after the return from the Captivity, Neh.viii. SCOTT observes :—

Doubtless, this was not merely confined to one person or place; but numbers were engaged in different situations, so that every one might have an opportunity of hearing. Though the men alone were obliged to attend at the festivals, it might be supposed that many of the women, children, and servants, would come on this occasion. A few (!) instances of the observation of this command are recorded; but the neglect of it seems to be one main cause why the nation was so soon carried away with idolatry and iniquity.

789. The *only* instances, to which SCOTT refers his readers, are *two*:—(i) that in the time of Josiah, after the discovery of the 'Book of the Law,' when, probably, the book of Deuteronomy was read to the people,—but this was an accidental occurrence, *not* at the Feast of the Tabernacles, and in no way to be regarded as an instance of obedience to the Law—and (ii) that of Ezra's reading after the return from the Captivity. There is not the slightest indication that Samuel, David, Solomon, or Hezekiah, paid any attention to this important Law.

790. D.xxi.14–15.

Evidently, these two verses, in which the 'Tabernacle' is mentioned, are part of the older document. The Deuteronomist never refers to the Tabernacle,—perhaps, as we have said, from the circumstance that he had it not daily before his mind's eye, as he had the *Ark*, (which he names in x.1,2,3,5,8, xxxi.9,25,26,) the Tabernacle of David having long disappeared from the sight, and almost from the memories, of men, while the Ark was still in the Temple.

791. In this passage it will be seen that Moses and Joshua go into the Tabernacle, as in E.xxxiii.7–11, the Tabernacle, apparently, being supposed to stand, as then, *without* the camp, E.xxxiii.7; and Jehovah appears in the 'pillar of cloud,' which stands over the door of the Tabernacle,' v.15, just as in E.xxxiii.9. So, also, we read in N.xii.4,5,—

'And Jehovah spake suddenly unto Moses and unto Aaron and unto Miriam, *Come out*, ye three, unto the Tabernacle of the Congregation. And they three *came out*. And Jehovah came down in the pillar of the cloud,

and stood in the door of the Tabernacle, and called Aaron and Miriam; and they both came forth.'

In short, it seems plain that D.xxxi.14,15, is due to the same writer as E.xxxiii.7–11 and N.xii.4,5, whoever this may be.

CHAPTER XIX.

THE SONG OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXII.

792. D.xxxii.1–43.

This 'Song' contains a great number of words which occur nowhere else in the Bible, and does not contain many of the Deuteronomist's favourite expressions. It does, however, contain *some* of them, e.g. v.8, 'make to inherit,'—v.16, 'provoke,'—v.17, 'whom they knew not,'—v.18, 'forget Jehovah,'—each of which, as we have seen (525,527), is repeated several times in Deuteronomy, and is used also by Jeremiah (539,540), but not one of which is found in any of the other Books of the Pentateuch. In the larger edition we have given a complete list of the many other identical forms of expression, which are common to the writer of this Song and the Deuteronomist.

793. The occurrence of so many unusual words, which are not found elsewhere in the Bible, might have been reasonably looked for in a Song like this, written in the highest style of poetry, and not in the mere rhetorical prose of the rest of the Book. And for the same reason we should not expect to find many of the prosaic phrases, which are so common in the other parts of the Book, repeated here. We conclude, therefore, that it is probably due to the Deuteronomistic author. But there are some eminent critics who are of a different opinion, and suppose that the Deuteronomist found the Song already in existence, and worked it into his own narrative.

794. In this passage we have clear signs of the late date at which this Song was written. Thus we read, v.15,17:

'But Jeshurun waxed fat and kicked;
Thou art waxen fat, thou art grown thick,
thou art covered with fatness.
Then he forsook God which made him,

And lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation.
 They provoked Him to jealousy with strange gods:
 With abominations provoked they Him to anger.
 They sacrificed unto devils, to no-gods (E.V. 'not to God'),
 To gods whom they knew not,
 To new gods that came newly up,
 Whom your fathers feared not.'

Of course, the above words cannot be supposed to describe the state of Israel in the wilderness. Those, who desire to maintain the Mosaic origin of this Book, will have recourse to the supposition of 'prophetical perfects.' After the evidence, which we have had before us, of the later origin of the Book, there can be little doubt that the words really refer to the idolatries practised in the kingdom of Israel, and almost as freely in Judah also.

795. So v.35-43 refer also very plainly to the hardships which the captives of the Ten Tribes had already suffered, and which, in His own due time, Jehovah would visit upon their conquerors:—

'To me belongeth vengeance and recompense;
 Their foot shall slide in due time:
 For the day of their calamity is at hand,
 And the things, that shall come upon them,
 make haste.

For Jehovah shall judge His people,
 And repent Himself for His servants,
 When He seeth that their power is gone,
 And there is none shut up or left. . . .
 Rejoice, O ye nations, with His people;
 For He will avenge the blood of His servants,
 And will render vengeance to His adversaries,
 And will be merciful unto His land and to His people.'

The writer appears to be *looking back* upon the time of distress which the sister-kingdom had experienced, and using it as a warning for Judah.

796. D.xxxii.48-52.

This is an enlarged form of the announcement of the death of Moses, which we find in N.xxvii.12-14, and belongs to the older document; except that it can hardly be supposed that the original writer would have put into the mouth of Jehovah the words—

'which is in the land of Moab, which is over against Jericho,'—

thus defining for *Moses himself* the exact site of the mountain, close to which he is supposed to be at this very time encamped. Accordingly, these words

are, most probably, a Deuteronomistic interpolation, and we have already seen that '*land of Moab*' is a *Deuteronomistic* phrase, (525.i), whereas '*plains of Moab*' is that employed by the older writer (523.xi).

797. That the whole passage, however, with the above exception, is a fragment of the older document, appears from the following phrases:—

(i) v.48, 'in the bone of this day'=on the self-same day, (523.v);

(ii) v.49, 'land of Canaan' (523.ix);

(iii) *dkhuzzah*, possession (523.i);

(iv) v.50, 'be gathered to thy people' (523.vi)

(v) v.51, 'trespass,' L.v.15, vi.2, xxvi.40, N.v.6,12,27, xxxi.16,—*nowhere else*;

(vi) 'wilderness of Zin,' N.xiii.21, xx.1, xxvii.14, xxxiii.36, xxxiv.3,4,—*nowhere else in Deuteronomy*.

CHAPTER XX.

THE BLESSING OF MOSES.

DEUT.XXXIII.1-7.

798. D.xxxiii also, which contains the 'Blessing of Moses,' is ascribed by many eminent critics to a rather older writer than the Deuteronomist.

As before, however, a close critical examination of its contents, as given at length in the larger edition, seems to us to fix this passage also, though not, perhaps, so certainly as ch.xxxii, upon the later Prophet, who wrote the rest of Deuteronomy. And in v.10 we have *Levi*, i.e. the Levites generally, spoken of as chosen to 'put incense before' Jehovah, and 'whole burnt sacrifice upon His Altar,' which proper duties of the Priesthood, as we have seen, the Deuteronomist assigns to the 'whole tribe of Levi,' whereas by the earlier writers they are restricted to the 'sons of Aaron.'

799. Besides which, if this poem was written by a different writer from him who wrote the rest of the Book of Deuteronomy, we should expect to see *more of that writer's compositions* mixed up in the Pentateuch. At least, it would be strange if so powerful a composer wrote no more than this, or that no more of his compositions have come down to us. It is shown in the larger edition that very many of the *peculiar* expressions of this chapter do resemble considerably the style of the Deuteronomist and of Jeremiah; while there

is no such *special* resemblance between them and those of the other Books of the Pentateuch. The fact, that the resemblance between this passage and the rest of Deuteronomy is not more complete and decisive, and that it contains many words found nowhere else in the Bible, may arise from this composition, like the Song in ch. xxxii, being highly poetical, whereas Deuteronomy itself is only *poetical prose*.

800. Perhaps, *both* the Song and the Blessing, or, at least, the Blessing, may even have been written some years before the Book of Deuteronomy, if (as is not at all impossible) the writer intended them originally to close his new edition of the earlier document, before he conceived the idea of writing the Book of Deuteronomy itself. The writings of a young poet are often much more *florid* and *artificial* than those composed by him in more mature life, after the experience of even a few years. If, then, upon a closer consideration of the contents of this chapter, we find nothing which really militates with the supposition that the Deuteronomist was its author, there is no reason why we may not—provisionally, at least—ascribe this also to him.

801. We may first, however, quote the words of KURTZ, who, it will be seen, while contending for the Mosaic authorship of the main part of the 'Blessing,' yet is compelled by his sense of truth to make admissions, which are, in fact, fatal to its Mosaic origin. He writes as follows, iii. 493:—

The authenticity of the 'Blessing of Moses' has been most conclusively demonstrated by DIESTEL. In fact, there is nothing in the particular blessings, which could give the least warrant for regarding it as a *vatium post eventum*. The introductory and concluding clauses, however, the critic just named feels obliged to set down as additions of a later hand. But, so far as the concluding words are concerned, I do not see on what ground the authorship of Moses can possibly be disputed. It is somewhat different with the introduction, seeing that there is at least one clause here, (*viz.* in v. 4, 'Moses commanded us a Law,') which seems to favour DIESTEL'S view. It must be admitted that these words sound somewhat strangely from the lips of Moses. . . . If the passage before us had read, 'Moses gave you a Law,' there would be nothing strange about it. But, when we bear in mind that Moses did not write down this 'Blessing,' as

he did the 'Song' and the Law of Deuteronomy,—that, on the contrary, he uttered them verbally to the people a short time—perhaps immediately—before his departure to Mount Nebo, and that they were probably first appended to the Book by the last editor of the Pentateuch, there cannot be anything very dangerous in the assumption that the introductory, and possibly also the concluding, words, which were the production of some other divinely-inspired psalmist, were also added by him.

802. But it can scarcely be believed that any one would have presumed to introduce in this way his own words in v. 4, in the midst of such a remarkable composition, the memorial of the last hours of the Lawgiver. And so SCOTT says:—

It is probable that the heads of the several tribes gathered around Moses, after he had received the summons recorded in the close of the former chapter, and just before he ascended the Mount where he ended his life, and that he delivered to them, both by word of mouth and in writing, these his last dying words.

What 'danger' can there be in our following the light of Truth, and admitting the fact, which is patent, that v. 4 at all events, was certainly not written nor uttered by Moses, and that, consequently, it is highly probable *a priori* that the whole 'Blessing' is by a later hand?

803. D. xxxiii. 6.

'Let REUBEN live, and not die;
'And let his men be somewhat (*lit.* a number),'
v. 6.

There is some doubt as to the proper rendering of the second line of the above. The E.V. supplies 'not' from the foregoing line, as in Ps. xxxviii. 1, lxxv. 5, 'And let his men (not) be a number,' i.e. not be so small as to be numbered; the LXX has 'and let him be many in number.' But it is obvious that the feeble wish implied in the clause, 'and not die,' hardly agrees with the LXX translation. REUBEN receives, indeed, a blessing, but one which sounds mournfully, and tells of the dwindled numbers of the tribe in the writer's time. In the days of Jehu we are informed, 2K. x. 32, 33:—

'Jehovah began to cut Israel short, and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of Israel, from Jordan eastward, all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan.'

And this is the last glimpse which we have of Reuben in the history.

804. It is next noticeable that SIMEON is altogether omitted. KNOBEL observes, *Deut.* p. 344:—

‘In many texts and editions of the LXX, the second member of v. 6 reads thus, ‘And let Simeon be many in number.’ This seems to be the original Text. The wish suits Simeon very well, who at the second numbering was much smaller than at the former. He would then be connected with Reuben as Issachar is with Zebulon, v. 18. If this is not allowed, then we must suppose him left out for the reason given in G. xlix. 7, [where Jacob says of Simeon and Levi, ‘Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce, and their wrath, for it was cruel; I will divide them in Jacob, and scatter them in Israel.’]

805. KURTZ also remarks, ii. p. 493:—

The first thing which strikes us, on examining this ‘Blessing,’ is the omission of the tribe of Simeon. BAUMGARTEN observes that ‘we are not to imagine, from the fact that Simeon is passed over, that he is to be regarded as left without a blessing. In any case he was included in the general blessing in v. 1, 29, just as even the sons of Jacob, to whom threatening words were addressed by their father, were still said to be ‘blessed.’ But the fact that Simeon is not mentioned by name, and that the harsh words addressed to him by the patriarch, as well as to Reuben and Levi, are not softened down in his case, has been correctly explained as denoting that the sentence of dispersion pronounced on Simeon, according to which he was not to have an independent position, but to live within the boundaries of the rest, had not been repealed or mitigated, as in the case of Levi, in consequence of any act of obedience and faith, but, on the contrary, had been greatly strengthened by the wickedness of his prince Zimri, N. xxv. 14. A striking proof of this, we believe, is to be found in the remarkably diminished number of Simeon, N. xxvi. 14.’ This is, probably, the best solution of the difficulty, if we are unable to adopt DIESTEL’s conclusion, that the ‘Blessing’ has not come down to us in its fullest integrity.

806. But was not the rebellion of Dathan, Abiram, and On, sons of Reuben, which drew down upon the people a plague, by which—

‘14,700 perished, beside them that died about the matter of [the Levite] Korah,’ N. xvi. 49,—a very notable event, as well as the affair of Zimri by which 24,000 died? Yet Reuben receives a blessing, though a mild one. And what reason is there to suppose that the Simeonites, generally, were more guilty than the other tribes, because one of their princes was compromised?

The fact is, most probably, that in the time of the writer—and, therefore,

long after the time which KNOBEL assigns to him—the tribe of Simeon had for some reason or other—whether because to a large extent absorbed in Judah, or, it may be, because of a considerable migration,—been long altogether lost sight of.

807. The tribe of Simeon, we are told,—

‘obtained their inheritance in the midst of the inheritance of the men of Judah,’ Jo. xix. 1-9.

Seventeen cities, with the surrounding villages, are assigned to them, which means, no doubt, that, at the time when this passage was written, the Simeonites were either found occupying these cities, or were known to have occupied them in former days, or, at least, to have had some special connection with them. But of these seventeen towns, Hormah and Beersheba are numbered, in the times of David and Ahab, respectively, among the towns of Judah, 1S. xxx. 30, 1K. xix. 3. Another of their towns, Ziklag, was given by the Philistine king, Achish, to David, 1S. xxvii. 6; and so we read,—

‘wherefore Ziklag pertaineth unto the kings of Judah unto this day.’

They are said to have conquered, with Judah’s help, Hormah, Gaza, Askelon, and Ekron, Ju. i. 17, 18; but they could not keep their hold on these cities, since Hormah, as we have said, is reckoned to Judah in 1S. xxx. 26, 30, and the other three are spoken of as independent Philistine cities in 1S. vi. 17. It is mentioned in 2Ch. xi. 6 that Rehoboam ‘built’ Etham or Ether, which also belonged to Simeon, Jo. xix. 7.

808. Thus seven, at all events, of their seventeen towns were lost to them, four of which are distinctly reckoned to Judah. And, imperceptibly, the tribe of Simeon appears, as we have said, to have become to a large extent absorbed in Judah; and, at last—mainly, we may suppose, for this reason—they entirely disappear from the history. In 1K. xii. 21, 23, where the military force of Rehoboam is mustered, which, we must suppose, from their situation, included the Simeonites, they are not mentioned, and we read:—

‘The word of God came unto Shemalah,

the man of God, saying, Speak unto Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, king of Judah, and unto all the house of Judah and Benjamin, and to the remnant of the people.'

809. If any Simeonites were then numbered among the troops of Rehoboam, they must have been included among this 'remnant of the people.' Their name, in fact, is not once mentioned in the Books of Samuel and Kings, though it occurs in the Books of Chronicles, 1Ch.iv.42,vi.65,xii.25,xxvii.16,2Ch.xv.9,xxxiv.6; and in one of these places, 1Ch.xii.25, they are spoken of as bringing help to David:—

'Of the children of Simeon, mighty men of valour for the war, seven thousand one hundred.'

But this statement must, like so many other of the Chronicler's data, be rejected as untrustworthy.*

810. There is, however, a curious note preserved by the Chronicler, 1Ch.iv.39-41, apparently from some ancient tradition, which seems to imply an important migration from the land of Canaan of a large body of the Simeonites:—

'And they went to the entrance of Gedor, unto the east side of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks. And they found fat pasture and good, and the land was wide, and quiet, and peaceable; for they of Ham had dwelt there of old. And these written by name went in the days of Hezekiah, king of Judah, and smote their tents, and the habitations that were found there, and de-

stroyed them utterly unto this day, and dwelt in their rooms; because there was pasture there for their flocks.'

It has been argued of late by Dozy, not without much appearance of reason, that this points to a considerable movement of the Simeonites from their original settlements in the south of Canaan, into the neighbourhood of Mecca in Arabia.

811. D.xxxiii.7.

*'Hear, Jehovah, the voice of JUDAH,
And bring him unto his people;
Let his hands be sufficient for him,
And be Thou an help to him from his enemies,'
v.7.*

Very remarkable is the difference in tone between this prayer, almost a cry of anguish, and the grand words which are spoken of Judah in the 'Blessing of Jacob,' G.xlix.8-12:—

'Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise;
Thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies;
Thy father's children shall bow down before thee.

Judah is a lion's whelp:
From the prey, my son, thou art gone up;
He stooped down, he couched as a lion,
And as an old lion—who shall rouse him up?

The sceptre shall not depart from Judah,
Nor a lawgiver from between his feet,
Until he come to Shiloh, [E.V. 'Until Shiloh come'];

And unto him shall the gathering of the people be.

Binding his foal unto the vine,
And his ass's colt unto the choice vine,
He washed his garments in wine,
And his clothes in the blood of grapes.
His eyes shall be red with wine,
And his teeth white with milk.'

812. According to our view, the words, 'bring him unto his people,' express a prayer that the tribe of Judah might again be restored to its old sovereignty, by the return of the Ten Tribes, at no very distant day, under the sceptre of the sons of David. This seems, in fact, to have occurred already in some measure in Josiah's time, 2K.xxiii.15-20, by the gathering of the scattered fragments of them still remaining in the land, and these, probably, far more numerous than is generally supposed. We have seen (780) that the Deuteronomist did, apparently, entertain such a fond hope for the restoration of Israel.

* Here, of those who supported David, there are numbered only 6,800 of David's own tribe of Judah, and 3,000 of Benjamin; whereas the Levites (including the Aaronites) were, according to the Chronicler, 8,300, and the Simeonites 7,100; and of Ephraim there were 28,000, of Western Manasseh, 18,000, of Zebulun, 50,000, of Naphtali, 1,000 captains, with 37,000 men, of Dan, 28,600, of Asher, 40,000, of Issachar, 200 men, 'that had understanding of the times, to know what Israel ought to do,' v.32, with all their brethren at their command, of the trans-Jordanic tribes, 120,000, [44,760 only, 1Ch.v.18—? in whose reign,] making altogether 348,000 men—five times as large as Wellington's whole force at Waterloo, ALISON, xix.401—of which Judah supplied only 6,800! and Simeon, 7,100! and 'all (!) these men of war, that could keep rank, came with a perfect heart to Hebron, to make David king over all Israel; and all the rest also of Israel were of one heart to make David king. And there they were with David three days, eating and drinking; for their brethren had prepared for them.' 1Ch.xii.38,39.

813. And so, too, Jeremiah breathes the same in his prophecies, xxx.3-9:—

'For, lo, the days come, saith Jehovah, that I will bring again the captivity of my people *Israel* and *Judah*, saith Jehovah, and I will cause them to return to the land that I gave to their fathers, and they shall possess it. . . . For it shall come to pass in that day, saith Jehovah of Hosts, that I will break his yoke from off thy neck, and will burst thy bonds, and strangers shall no more serve themselves of him. But they shall serve Jehovah their God, and David their king, whom I will raise up unto them.'

And see also the glorious prophecies in Jer.xxxi,xxxiii, where we read,—

'There shall be a day that the watchmen upon the *Mount Ephraim* shall cry, 'Arise ye, and let us go up to *Zion*, unto Jehovah our God,' xxxi.6;

'For thus saith Jehovah, If my covenant be not with day and night, and if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth, then will I cast away the seed of Jacob and David my servant, so that I will not take any of his seed to be rulers over the house of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; for I will cause their captivity to return, and have mercy upon them.' xxxiii.25,26.

814. In point of fact, the deportation of the Ten Tribes into Captivity seems to have been by no means so great and so universal as is generally supposed. After Shalmaneser had 'carried *Israel* away into *Assyria*,' 2K.xvii.6, we are told that 'Hezekiah wrote letters to *Ephraim* and *Manasseh*,' to beg them to come and keep the Passover;

'but they laughed them to scorn, and mocked them; nevertheless, divers of *Asher* and *Manasseh* and *Zebulun* humbled themselves, and came to *Jerusalem*,' 2Ch.xxx.10,11.

This, however, depends on the unsupported testimony of the Chronicler.

815. But Josiah's authority evidently extended over *Samaria* as well as *Judah*; since he destroyed the altar which was at *Bethel*, and the high place which *Jeroboam* had made:—

'both that altar and the high place he brake down, and burned the high place, and stamped it small to powder, and burned the *Asherah* [E.V. *grove*]. . . And all the houses also of the high places, that were in the cities of *Samaria*, which the kings of *Israel* had made to provoke Jehovah to anger, Josiah took away, and did to them according to all the acts that he had done in *Bethel*. . . And he slew all the priests of the high places, that were there, upon the altars, and burned men's bones upon them, and returned to *Jerusalem*.' 2K.xxiii.15-20.

It is possible, also, that in this phrase,

'bring him unto his people,' there may be a reference to the words spoken of *Judah* in Jacob's blessing, G.xlix.10, 'Unto him shall the gathering of the people be.'

CHAPTER XXI.

THE BLESSING OF MOSES, DEUT.XXXIII.8-12.

816. D.xxxiii.8-11.

And of LEVI he said,
Let Thy Thummim and Thy Urim be with Thy holy one;
Whom Thou didst prove at Massah,
Whom Thou didst right (E.V. 'strive with,' but see Is.i.17, where we have 'strive for' [E.V. 'plead for'] = 'right' the widow,) *at the waters of Meribah;*
Who said of his father and his mother, I saw him not;
Neither did he acknowledge his brethren, nor knew his own children;
For they have observed Thy word,
And they have kept Thy covenant.
They shall teach Jacob Thy judgments,
And Israel Thy Law;
They shall put incense before Thee,
And whole burnt sacrifice upon Thine Altar.
Bless, O Jehovah, his substance,
And accept the work of his hands;
Smite through the loins of them that rise against him,
And of them that hate him, that they rise not again.

817. Still more surprising, than even that which we have observed in the case of *Judah*, is the contrast between the strong language of praise here addressed to *Levi*, and the sentence of censure in G.xlix.5-7:

'SIMON and LEVI are brethren;
Instruments of cruelty are in their habitations.
O my soul, come not thou into their secret;
Unto their assembly, mine honour, be not thou united;
For in their anger they slew a man,
And in their selfwill they digged down a wall.
Cursed be their anger, for it was fierce,—
And their wrath, for it was cruel:
I will divide them in Jacob,
And scatter them in *Israel*.'

818. Indeed, the change is wholly unaccountable on the traditionary view. For the usual notion that, because of their zeal, in slaying three thousand of their brethren, about the affair of the golden calf, E.xxxii.26-28, (which some suppose to be referred to in v.9,) they were really distinguished with such words of high commendation, can scarcely be admitted, when it is remembered that *Aaron* himself, the head

of the tribe, to whose sons all its *chief* honours, in point of fact, were to be given, was the very leader in that sin, and was so greatly at fault also at the waters of Meribah, N.xx.12, that, for his offence on that occasion, he, as well as the other principal *Levite*, Moses, was sentenced to die, without setting his foot upon the holy land. We do not find in the narrative any account of the Levites distinguishing themselves at Massah and Meribah.

SCOTT, accordingly, remarks—

The Prophet, in this passage, seems to have referred to some remarkable instances, not elsewhere recorded, in which the Levites were tried, and honourably distinguished themselves in the cause of God.

819. If we suppose, however, as we may, that this chapter of Deuteronomy was written at a much later age—probably, at the very beginning of Josiah's reign before the composition of the rest of this book, or even towards the end of Manasseh's,—and that it was written by a Priest, perhaps, even by Jeremiah himself,—it is easy to explain every allusion in these verses. In those days, by all truly *religious* persons, devoted to the worship of Jehovah, the Levites—at least, the Chief Priest and the other Levites or Priests, who ministered at the Sanctuary—if known as earnest and devout men, would be held in high estimation, as the guardians of the true faith in a corrupt age, amidst an idolatrous and gain-saying generation.

820. Well, then, might the writer in this passage—a Priest himself—utter for his own brethren, (including his own father, who may have been Hilkiah, then perhaps already, as he was a few years afterwards, 2K.xxii.4, at the head of the Priesthood,) the prayer,—‘Let Thy Thummim and Thy Ūrim—Thy Truth and Thy Light—be ever with Thy holy one, *whom Thou didst prove at Massah* (temptation), *whom Thou didst justify at the waters of Meribah* (strife);’ i.e. whom Thou dost expose now, as Thou didst then, to the rebellious trying tempers,—the angry strife and turbulence,—of an unthankful unbelieving people.

821. If we refer to the story in

E.xvii, N.xx, we shall find that, in each case, the faith and patience of the religious leaders,—in one case, Moses, in the other, Moses and Aaron,—are represented as ‘tried’ in this way. The people come to them murmuring, and complaining that they had not the supplies of good things, or even necessities, which they required, and they are ready to go back to the ‘fleshpots of Egypt.’

‘And the people murmured against Moses, and said, Wherefore is this, that thou hast brought us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our cattle with thirst? And Moses cried unto Jehovah, saying, What shall I do unto this people? They be almost ready to stone me,’ E.xvii.3,4;

‘And they gathered themselves together against Moses and against Aaron. And the people chode with Moses, and spake, saying, Would God that we had died when our brethren died before Jehovah? And why have ye brought up the congregation of Jehovah into this wilderness, that we and our cattle should die there? And wherefore have ye made us to come up out of Egypt, to bring us unto this evil place? It is no place of seed, or of figs, or of vines, or of pomegranates, neither is there any water to drink,’ N.xx.2-5.

822. Who can doubt that in the age of the later kings, and especially just before the time of Josiah's Reformation, there must have been much ‘murmuring’ of this kind, even among those who still adhered outwardly to the worship of Jehovah, but in their hearts had gone back to Egypt, and were ready to say with those of old, E.xvii.7, ‘Is Jehovah among us or not?’ A pious and zealous Priest, like Hilkiah, must have had a painful life in such times, with those in high places (Manasseh and his princes) violently opposed to his endeavours to keep up the true faith in the Living God. He must have found it a hard task at times to bear up, in the path of duty, against the strength of public feeling,—the expressed illwill of some, the secret dislike of others, the neglect and indifference of almost all. Living in such days, and sharing fully in the sentiments of his more faithful brethren, the writer might well refer to the record of similar ‘trials’ of the great leaders in the wilderness,—to their being succoured and supported by Divine Power, when tempted,—to their being ‘righted’ or ‘justified’ before

the people by the direct interference of Jehovah, in answer to their cry, and in reply to the rebellious unbelief of the multitude.

823. So would it be again, the writer hopes, in God's own time. Let the Levite (*i.e.* the Priest) be faithful still to his sacred calling, saying to father, mother, brothers, children, 'I know you not;' *i.e.* let him not be turned by any family ties from the straight path of duty; let him be ready to *forsake home and its delights*, (as some, doubtless, of that day had done,) and—

'go up from the gates out of all Israel where he sojourned, and come with all the desire of his mind to minister in the Name of Jehovah his God at Jerusalem,' D. xviii. 6, 7.

Let him still possess his soul in faith and patience, 'observing Jehovah's word, and keeping His Covenant,' 'teaching Jacob His judgments, and Israel His Law,' 'putting incense before Him, and whole burnt sacrifices upon His Altar.' Then would the Blessing of the Most High attend him; then would he in due time be 'justified,' though 'tried' to the uttermost; his Priesthood should continue, his office be held in honour, his judgments be respected, his teachings obeyed. Then Jehovah would 'bless his substance, and accept the work of his hands,—would smite through the loins of them that rise against him, (the adversaries of the true religion, whether high or low, in Israel,) and of them that hate him, that they rise not again.'

Such appears to us the more rational and intelligible explanation of these verses, regarded as referring to the circumstances of the times in which the writer lived.

824. It is true that Jeremiah in many passages of his prophecies describes the state of the *Priests*, as well as of the *Prophets*, in his time as excessively bad: *e.g.*—

'The *Priests* said not, Where is Jehovah? and they that handle the Law knew me not: the pastors also transgressed against me, and the *Prophets* prophesied by Baal,' ii. 8;

'As the thief is ashamed, when he is found, so is the house of Israel ashamed, they, their Kings, their Princes, and their *Priests*, and their *Prophets*, saying to a stock, Thou art my father, and to a stone, Thou hast brought me forth; for they have turned their back

unto me, and not their face,' ii. 26, 27, xxxii. 32, 33;

'A wonderful and horrible thing is committed in the land,—The *Prophets* prophesy falsely, and the *Priests* bear rule by their means; and my people love to have it so; and what will ye do in the end thereof?' v. 30, 31;

'From the least of them even unto the greatest of them every one is given to covetousness; and from the *Prophet* even unto the *Priest* every one dealeth falsely,' vi. 13, viii. 10;

'Both *Prophet* and *Priest* are profane; yea, in my House have I found their wickedness, saith Jehovah,' xxiii. 11;

'For the sins of her *Prophets* and the iniquities of her *Priests*, that have shed the blood of the just in the midst of her,' &c., Lam. iv. 13.

825. Yet still there must have been exceptions to this general rule. In Josiah's reign Zephaniah prophesied, and Jeremiah himself was both a Priest and a Prophet; and there seems no reason to suppose that Hilkiah and the Priests under him were any other than pious men, who did their best to discharge the duties of their office amidst the difficulties of the time. This passage may have been written at a time when Hilkiah was in office, and had entered on his sacred duties with a deep sense of his responsibilities, and a determination to stem, to the uttermost of his power, the corruption of the times. But the writer may also, and specially, have had in view that glorious restoration for which he longed, when 'the sons of David' should reign in righteousness, and the 'sons of Levi' minister in faithfulness, in the midst of the regenerated and rejoicing people.

826. To this hope Jeremiah points when he says,—

'Jehovah hath redeemed Jacob, and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he. Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of Zion, and shall flow together to the goodness of Jehovah, for wheat, and for wine, and for oil, and for the young of the flock and of the herd; and their soul shall be as a watered garden, and they shall not sorrow any more at all . . . And I will satiate the soul of the *Priests* with fatness, and my people shall be satisfied with my goodness, saith Jehovah,' xxxi. 11, 14;

'Thus saith Jehovah, David shall never want a man to sit upon the throne of the house of Israel; neither shall the *Priests* the *Levites* want a man before me to offer burnt-offerings, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually,' xxxiii. 17, 18;

'Thus saith Jehovah, If ye can break my covenant of the day, and that there should not be day and night in their season, then

may also my covenant be broken with David my servant, that he should not have a son to reign upon his throne, and with the *Levites the Priests*, my ministers. As the host of heaven cannot be numbered, neither the sand of the sea measured, so will I multiply the seed of David my servant and the *Levites that minister unto me*, xxxiii.20-22.

827. D.xxxiii.12.

'Of BENJAMIN he said,
The beloved of Jehovah shall dwell securely (by Him, E.V.);
He shall cover him at all times, and dwell between his shoulders.'

KNOBEL notices the peculiar order in which the tribes are here mentioned, differing from any other in which they are found in the Bible; and he explains this fact by supposing that the writer meant to notice them in a kind of 'geographical order from South to North.' But it will be seen at once that this account of the matter is not at all satisfactory; since, even if we suppose that Levi, being so closely connected with Jerusalem, might properly be placed between Judah and Benjamin, yet Gad lay on the eastern side of Jordan, to the north of Reuben, and is placed between Issachar and Dan, both on the western side, with which it had no geographical relations.

828. Perhaps, the following explanation of the order here observed may be more satisfactory. Reuben comes first, as usual, as firstborn, and it is possible also, as having been, from his position, on the eastern side of the Dead Sea, less exposed to the consequences of the great Assyrian invasion, than the other trans-Jordanic tribes, which lay *more directly* in the track of the invading hosts. The remnant of Reuben, therefore, in Josiah's time may really have been more considerable than those of Gad and Eastern Manasseh. Then come Judah, Levi, Benjamin, the *only* substantial tribes remaining in Josiah's time, Simeon having disappeared (804-810), and Judah forming with Benjamin, the kingdom of Judah. Hence we find Jeremiah joining together repeatedly 'the cities of Judah, and the places about Jerusalem, and the land of Benjamin,' xvii.26, xxxii.44, xxxiii.13. The other tribes had all been carried captive. They are named, however, one after another, as they *must* have

been by one personating the part of Moses, and something is said about each, corresponding, probably, in some measure to their circumstances either then or aforetime, as well as to those *which the writer fondly hoped to see in due time revived through the Mercy of God*, when Judah should be 'brought to his people' again.

829. KNOBEL notes as follows on the blessing of Benjamin, p.347:

Benjamin dwells securely, since Jehovah, as his Protector, hangs over him, and has his earthly abode between the ridges of Benjamin . . . The writer points to Gibeon, where the Tabernacle stood after the destruction of Nob through Saul. The modern *Djib*, two full hours north-west from Jerusalem, with four fountains and springs, lies on a ridge in the middle of a fruitful and pleasant valley or basin, which consists of broad valleys or plains, and is surrounded by different mountains. The length of the beautiful valley is, from east to west, ten English miles, the breadth five miles. The word *katheph*, 'wing, shoulder,' in geographical notices, signifies not the side generally, but the mountain-side, which rises to the mountain or mountain-ridge, N.xxxiv.11, Jo.xv.8, 10, xviii.12,13,16,18,&c. The passage cannot, therefore, apply to Jerusalem, since Jehovah dwelt there not between mountain-ridges, but on Moriah. So, too, it does not suit Jerusalem, if we take *katheph* in the sense of 'side,' and understand the notice of the territory of Benjamin, generally. For Jerusalem lay on the south side of this tribal territory, and not in the midst of Benjamin. The phrase, 'between the shoulders,' occurs also 1S.xvii.6. The suspended javelin hung down from the right shoulder to the left hip, and so between the shoulders.

830. There is, however, no good reason to believe that the 'Tabernacle' ever was transferred from Nob to Gibeon, as KNOBEL, and many other eminent writers suppose. It is true the *Chronicles* states that it was at Gibeon in the time of David and Solomon, 1Ch.xvi.37-40, xxi.29, 2Ch.i.3-6: *e.g.*—

'David left there, before the Ark of the covenant of Jehovah in Jerusalem, Asaph and his brethren to minister before the Ark continually, as every day's work required, and Zadok the Priest and his brethren the Priests, before the Tabernacle of Jehovah, in the high place that was at Gibeon, to offer burnt-offerings unto Jehovah upon the Altar of the burnt-offering continually, morning and evening, and to do according to all that is written in the Law of Jehovah, which he commanded Israel.' 1Ch.xvi.37-40.

831. But the more authentic history, in the books of Samuel and Kings, says nothing whatever of the Tabernacle being at Gibeon, which is the more

remarkable, since in the latter it is recorded that—

‘Solomon went to Gibeon to sacrifice there, for that was the great high-place; a thousand burnt-offerings did Solomon offer upon that altar.’ 1K.iii.4.

The writer would surely have mentioned the existence of the Mosaic Tabernacle and the Brazen Altar of Bezaleel at Gibeon at this time, as some reason for Solomon’s sacrificing there, if he knew that they were there,—more especially as in the previous verse, v.3, he blames Solomon for ‘sacrificing and burning incense in high places.’

832. We might ask, again, which, in the opinion of the Chronicler, was the place which ‘Jehovah had chosen to put his Name in,’—Gibeon, with its Tabernacle and Brazen Altar, where ‘Zadok and the Priests’ attended, but where the Ark was not,—or Mount Zion, where the Ark and Mercy-Seat were placed, and where ‘God dwelt between the cherubims,’ though only the *Levites*, ‘Asaph and his brethren,’ were stationed to ‘minister before it continually’? Under such circumstances, the people would have paid a very divided allegiance. And it is difficult to understand how Solomon could sacrifice *before the Ark* at Jerusalem, 1K.iii.15, when neither the *Priests* were there, nor the *Brazen Altar*, upon which alone it was lawful for him to sacrifice, according to the Law laid down in L.xvii.8,9,—

Whatsoever man there be of the house of Israel, or of the strangers which sojourn among you, that offereth a burnt-offering or a sacrifice, and bringeth it not unto the door of the Tabernacle of the Congregation, to offer it unto Jehovah, even that man shall be cut off from among his people.

Hence, in Jo.xxii.29, the trans-Jordanic tribes are made to say—

‘God forbid that we should rebel against Jehovah, and turn this day from following Jehovah, to build an altar for burnt offerings, for meat-offerings, or for sacrifices, beside the Altar of Jehovah our God, that is before His Tabernacle.’

833. Further, if the Tabernacle was ever moved from Shiloh to Nob, and from Nob to Gibeon, how is it that we have no account of such removal, either in the books of Samuel or of Chronicles? It was just as great an act of sacrilege, according to the Pentateuch, to touch

the Tabernacle with profane hands, as to touch the Ark itself.

‘When the Tabernacle setteth forward, the *Levites* shall take it down; and when the Tabernacle is to be pitched, the *Levites* shall set it up; and the stranger that cometh nigh shall be put to death,’ N.i.51.

Since, therefore, the Tabernacle was so much more cumbrous than the Ark, much greater preparations must have been made for moving it than for merely taking up the Ark; and, surely, some notice would have been taken in the history of so remarkable an event.

834. Above all, how was it that the Ark, when brought back from the Philistines, was not restored to the ‘Tabernacle of Moses,’ by the directions of Samuel, if that Tabernacle was really at hand, instead of being stored away for so many years in the house of Abinadab, 1S.vii.1,2? And what need was there for David to have built a Tabernacle on Mount Zion, to hold the Ark, if the ‘Tabernacle of the Congregation’ was actually in existence? Surely, no tent that he could build was so fitted to receive it as this grand ancient Mosaic Tabernacle, so venerable through its age, and so unspeakably sacred from its history,—framed, even as to its minutest details, as is supposed, after the express instructions of Jehovah, according to ‘the pattern which Moses saw in the Mount,’ E.xxv.40,xxvi.30,—sanctified by the most holy and stupendous events, glorious with so many grand associations, endeared by the most precious memories,—which had shared all along the fortunes of Israel, and had passed through so many most astonishing and awful scenes in the wilderness—at the entrance of which not only Moses and Aaron had stood, but the Divine Presence itself had more than once been seen, when—

‘Jehovah came down in the pillar of a cloud, and stood in the door of the Tabernacle, and talked with them,’ N.xi.25,xii.5.

835. Though so splendid, also, with its costly curtains of ‘fine twined linen, blue, purple, and scarlet,’ its coverings of goats’ hair and rams’ skins, its boards of shittim-wood with their sockets of silver, upon which alone, as we are told, E.xxxviii.27, were spent a

hundred talents (34,000*l.*) of silver, — yet (according to the views of KNOBEL,) it had been often removed, and might, therefore, without any very serious difficulty have been removed again, — nay, (according to the Chronicler) it had certainly been once removed to Gibeon, and was not *worn out*, and unfit for further sacred uses, since Zadok and the Priests were stationed at it. Surely, such a Tabernacle as this would never have been allowed by the pious David to remain standing empty of the Ark which belonged to it, whether it stood at Shiloh or at Gibeon. He would not have dared to substitute for it one built by his own contrivance. It would have been an act of sacrilege to have done this. He *must* have brought up such a Tabernacle to Jerusalem, as the only fitting home for the Ark. We may, surely, say with confidence, it is *certain* that he would have done so, had such a Tabernacle really been at that time in existence.

836. We shall have occasion to consider more fully hereafter the history of those times, and the special history of the Ark and the Tabernacle. But we have, as we believe, shown sufficiently that there is no real ground for supposing that the Tabernacle was at Gibeon in the time of Saul. And, even if it had been, the Ark was not there, and *that* was the sign of Jehovah's Presence; He would scarcely be said to 'dwell' at a place where the Ark was not. From this, however, it appears that the very ground, on which KNOBEL's opinion rests, is gone from under him. And we fall back on the explanation that he rejects, *viz.* that the words *do* refer to Jerusalem, where the Ark was, and where Jehovah was specially said to 'cause His Name to dwell.' The word *Katheph*, 'shoulder,' is, in fact, used for 'side' in N.xxxiv. 11, 'the *side* of the sea of Chinnereth,' and so in 1K.vi.8,39, 'the right *side* of the House,' 2Ch.iv.10, 'he set the sea on the right *side* of the east end,' 2Ch.xxiii.10, 'from the right *side* of the Temple to the left *side* of the Temple.' Possibly, the idea in the writer's mind was this, that, as Jerusalem lay in the middle of the southern

boundary of Benjamin, it was thus between the shoulders of the tribe, *i.e.* between the southern ends of the *eastern* and *western* sides of it—supported, like the head, between the shoulders, as it were, and not lower down upon the back.

837. It may be noticed that it is the *Deuteronomist* alone, who speaks, as here, of Jehovah 'dwelling' in Jerusalem, and that the phrase, 'to rest safely,' occurs only in v.12,28 of this chapter, and in Jer.xxiii.6,xxxiii.16, Ps.xvi.9, Pri.i.33, in the first of which passages we have the whole phrase, as in D.xxxiii.28, 'Israel shall dwell safely.' We must not forget, also, that Jeremiah himself was one of the 'Priests that were at Anathoth in the land of Benjamin'; so that, when at home, he lived in 'one of the gates of Benjamin,' and felt, doubtless, a special tenderness for the tribe, which is here called the 'darling of Jehovah.'

CHAPTER XXII.

THE BLESSING OF MOSES,
DEUT.XXXIII.13-29.

838. D.xxxiii.13-17.

'And of JOSEPH he said,—
Blessed of Jehovah be his land,
For treasures of heaven above [E.V. 'for the dew'],
And of the deep that lieth beneath,
And for treasures brought forth by the sun,
And for treasures put forth by the moon,
And for the chief things of the ancient mountains,
And for treasures of the lasting hills,
And for treasures of the earth and fulness thereof,
And for the goodwill of Him that dwell in the bush;
The blessing shall come upon the head of Joseph,
And upon the crown of the consecrated of his brethren.
His firstborn steer is his glory;
And his horns are like the horns of a buffalo [E.V. 'unicorn'];
With them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth:
And they are the ten thousands of Ephraim,
And they are the thousands of Manasseh.'

839. This blessing on Joseph certainly presents at first sight some difficulty, since the Ten Tribes, of which Ephraim was the head, had been carried into Captivity in the days of Hezekiah, and therefore such language as the above would seem altogether

inapplicable to them in the time of Josiah. But a close consideration of the question will show that there is absolutely *no* one time in the history of the people, to which the different parts of the 'Blessing' will apply.

840. Moses could not have written it; for, if, looking down with prophetic eye along the stream of time, he had been moved by Divine impulse to utter these intimations as to the future destinies of the tribes of Israel, it is impossible that he should have dismissed the illustrious tribe of Judah, from which David and David's son, the Messiah, were to spring, with a few mournful words, and glorified the tribes of Joseph—who in later days were to be distinguished by rebellion, idolatry, and even apostasy from the worship of Jehovah—with such extraordinary laudation as this.

841. Nor will the time of SAMUEL suit better for all parts of the Blessing: since, though Judah was not yet famous, and Ephraim was very flourishing, yet *Levi* was quite in the background, and the remarkable language, which we have just been considering, v. 8-11, could hardly have been used with reference to that tribe.

Nor will the days of DAVID answer to the requirements of the case; for then *Judah* could not have been passed over so lightly, with so little distinction, or, rather, with a prayer expressive of sadness, while the praise of Joseph is loud and triumphant.

A similar consideration forbids still more decidedly the supposition of its having been composed in the age of SOLOMON, when the splendour of Judah was at its highest.

842. After Solomon's time, and the division of the two kingdoms, the question first arises, was the writer one of the *northern* or the *southern* kingdom? The glorification of Joseph might be thought, at first sight, to indicate the former. But, on the other hand, we observe that the Levitical Priesthood was confined to Jerusalem, and the roll of the Tetrarch was, no doubt, kept in their charge,—that there is no trace of the hand of a writer of the northern kingdom to be found in

any portion of it.—and that the mention of Jehovah 'dwelling' between the shoulders of Benjamin,—*i.e.* as we have seen, in Jerusalem,—as well as the high commendation of the Levites, points distinctly to a *Jewish* writer. But what Jewish writer, *during the existence of the separate kingdoms*, would have written of Judah so mildly and of Joseph so warmly, as the writer of this Blessing does?

843. Thus we are brought down to the time *after* the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, without finding any period, which suits all the parts of the Blessing. As far, therefore, as Joseph is concerned, there is no reason why it should not have been written in Josiah's time, as well as any other; and this time suits best, as we have seen, the words spoken about the other chief tribes. It is plain also that such laudatory language would be more likely to be used of Joseph by a pious Jewish writer, *when the northern kingdom no longer existed*, and when all the best feelings of an Israelite would go forth in tender pity and hope towards his brethren in their time of distress, than while it still stood forth as the rival, and, by its idolatries, the corruptor of Judah.

844. Compare, in this point of view, the language of *Jeremiah*, xxxi, and especially the following verses:

'At the same time, saith Jehovah, will I be the God of *all the families of Israel*, and they shall be my people,' v. 1.

'Again I will build thee, and thou shalt be built, *O virgin of Israel*; thou shalt again be adorned with thy tabrets, and shalt go forth in the dances of them that make merry,' v. 4.

'For there shall be a day that the watchmen upon the *Mount Ephraim* shall cry, Arise ye, and let us go up to *Zion*, unto Jehovah our God,' v. 6.

'Behold, I will bring them from the north country, and gather them from the wastes of the earth, . . . a great company shall return thither. They shall come with weeping, and with supplications will I lead them; I will cause them to walk by the rivers of waters in a straight way, wherein they shall not stumble; for I am a *Father to Israel*, and *Ephraim is my first-born*,' v. 8, 9.

'Hear the word of Jehovah, O ye nations, and declare it in the isles afar off, and say, *He that scattered Israel, will gather him, and keep him, as a shepherd doth his flock*. For Jehovah hath redeemed Jacob, and ransomed him from the hand of him that was stronger than he. Therefore they shall come and sing in the height of *Zion*, &c.' v. 10-12.

And, from beginning to end, the whole chapter sets forth these delightful prophetic anticipations of the future reunion of Israel and Judah, and their happy estate in those blessed days which were coming, when chastisement should have done its work effectually, v. 18, and the gracious promise should be fulfilled, v. 33,—

‘I will be their God, and they shall be my people.’

845. In short, the most reasonable explanation of the matter seems to us to be, that the Deuteronomist has here expressed confidently a prophetic *hope* for the future prosperity and glory of Joseph, as he has for the reunion of all the tribes under the sway of Judah, for the continuance of a pious and faithful Priesthood in the tribe of Levi, and for the permanent resting of Jehovah ‘between the shoulders’ of Benjamin. He views the whole people reunited once more; and thus, after briefly touching upon each of the other tribes, with a few words suggested by their situation, character, or past or present circumstances, he closes the address by imagining all Israel compacted again into one great nation, rejoicing once more in the favour and blessing of Jehovah, v. 26-29:—

There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun,
Who rideth upon the heaven in thy help,
And in His excellency on the sky.
The Eternal God is thy refuge,
And underneath are the Everlasting Arms;
And He shall thrust out the enemy from
before thee,

And shall say, Destroy them.
Israel then shall dwell in safety alone;
The fountain of Jacob shall be upon a land of
corn and wine;

Also his heavens shall drop down dew.
Happy art thou, O Israel!
Who is like unto thee, O people saved by
Jehovah,

The shield of thy help, and Who is the sword
of thy excellency!
And thine enemies shall dissemble (use glozing
speeches) unto thee,
And thou shalt tread upon their high places.’

846. This view of the blessing on Joseph will be found confirmed, when we examine the language of it, which, except v. 17, is in many places a literal transcript of the words addressed to Joseph in Jacob’s Blessing, G. xlix. 22-26, and respects only, as the reader will perceive, the *land* of Joseph, whose

extreme fertility is well known, and whose qualities were not affected by the captivity of its inhabitants. The chief of these correspondences are given below:—

G. XLIX.

- v. 25, Blessings of the heavens above,
Blessings of the deep that lieth beneath.
v. 26, To the desire of the everlasting hills:
They shall be upon the head of Joseph,
And on the crown of the consecrated of his
brethren.

D. XXXIII.

- v. 13, From treasures of the heavens above,
And from the deep that lieth beneath.
v. 15, And from treasures of the everlasting hills.
v. 16, It shall come upon the head of Joseph,
And on the crown of the consecrated of his
brethren.

847. It is plain that the writer *had before him* the ‘Blessing of Jacob.’ And, though he has *not* used its expressions in dealing with Reuben, Judah, Levi, or Benjamin, the tribes which were still in existence, and of which he could speak in accordance with their present circumstances, yet, when he comes to the captive Joseph, as if at a loss almost what to say, he refers to the older document, and adapts its very words with slight changes and amplifications. But, as before observed, the greater portion of the blessing refers entirely to the fertility of the land, including ‘the *goodness* of Him that dwelt in the bush,’ by which, probably, allusion is made to the expressions in E. iii. 8, ‘a *good* land and a large, a land flowing with milk and honey.’ Joseph is spoken of here, and in G. xlix. 26, as ‘consecrated by his brethren,’ because the tribe of Ephraim was recognised as the leader of the Northern tribes, (as Judah was of the Southern,) from a very early age down to the time of the Captivity.

848. In v. 17 is described the strength of this populous tribe, which, when restored to its pristine vigour, as the Prophet hoped, would push the nations with its horns, like a Reem or buffalo, as once it did of old in the days of David. Then should the son of David reign triumphantly once more in the place ‘which Jehovah had chosen to set His Name there,’ and Ephraim be the ‘strength of his head,’ and Judah his ‘Lawgiver.’ Joseph’s ‘firstborn steer’ is Ephraim, whom Jacob ‘set

before Manasseh,' his elder brother, G.xlviii.20, and whose tribe was in later times by far the strongest, in agreement with the words of the text,—

'And they are the ten thousands of Ephraim,
And they are the thousands of Manasseh;—

though not in accordance with the statements of the second 'muster' of the people at the end of their wanderings, according to which the number of Manasseh was 52,700, N.xxvi.34, and that of Ephraim only 32,500, v.37; and yet the story represents Moses as making this muster only just before he uttered the Song.

849. There is nothing very remarkable in the other blessings, which, as has been said, seem to be uttered, because something *must* be said of each tribe, (by one who had undertaken to place a blessing in the mouth of Moses, like that ascribed to Jacob,) with some kind of reference to their past or present circumstances, and with the hope that, though now only a remnant of each tribe occupied the seat of its forefathers, yet, in God's own time, the tribe would be restored to its old locality, and flourish abundantly again, and the Blessing be fulfilled. In almost every case there is a reference to the language used in the Blessing of Jacob, G.xlix, as if the Deuteronomist was at a loss for other words, in which to speak of these tribes now carried into captivity.

850. We add some remarks on each:

'Rejoice, ZEBULUN, in thy going out,
And, ISSACHAR, in thy tents,' v.18.

The relations of both tribes shall be joyful and prosperous, the one 'going out,' i.e. carrying on a brisk and pleasant commerce, e.g. with the Phœnicians,—(comp. G.xlix.13, 'Zebulun shall dwell at the haven of the sea, and he shall be for an haven of ships, and his border shall be unto Zidon,')—and the other remaining at home, and practising comfortably agriculture and cattle-breeding in the productive land where it dwells,—(comp. G.xlix.14,15, 'Issachar is a strong ass, couching down between two burdens; and he saw that rest was good, and the land that it was pleasant').

851. 'They shall call the people unto the Mountain;
Thus shall they offer sacrifices of righteousness,' v.19.

According to our view, the 'Mountain' here is the holy 'Mount Zion' at Jerusalem, to which, as the writer hoped, and as the Deuteronomist enjoined, *all* the tribes would in future days go willingly up in great numbers; though, of course, it was never supposed that the command for 'every male' to go up thrice a year would be literally obeyed. Comp. Jer.xxvi.18, 'the Mountain of the House,' and especially, Jer.xxxi.23, 'Thus saith Jehovah of hosts, the God of Israel, As yet they shall use this speech, in the land of Judah and in the cities thereof, when I shall bring again their (i.e. Ephraim's) captivity, Jehovah bless thee, O Habitation of justice, O Mountain of holiness!'

852. 'For they shall suck the affluence of the sea,
And the hidden treasures of the sand.'

They shall draw profit from the sea, have gain which the sea brings to them, e.g. through commerce generally, and the special trade in fish, purple-shells, and sponges, which is still carried on. By 'treasures of the sand' the writer seems to mean 'glass,' which by the ancients was considered as something costly, (Job.xxviii.17, 'The gold and the crystal cannot equal it,') and which has been found by the river Belus, a little south of Akko. Between Akko and Tyre, also, the coast yielded a glassy sand, which, however, was first melted in Sidon. In Tyre there are still remains of a glass-melting-house of ancient times.

853. 'Blessed be He that enlargeth Gad!
As a lion he coucheth, and teareth arm,
yea, and crown,' v.20.

Blessed be Jehovah, who gives this tribe a spacious territory, and lets him extend himself far and wide, (G.xlix.19, 'Gad, a troop shall overcome him; but he shall overcome at the last'). Just in the same way 'Blessing' is ascribed to the God of Shem in G.ix.26, where Shem's prosperity is to be brought forward. Gad is like a lion, which has made a prey, and, couching in peaceful security, tears it asunder and devours it.

854. 'And he saw the firstfruits [e.g. of the Conquest] for himself,' v. 21.

He 'saw for himself,' i.e. he chose, 'provided,' for himself, (as in G. xxii. 8,) the firstfruits of the conquest as a possession. This was the kingdom of Sihon; Gad had the northern half of it, and in the southern also he had cities, N. xxxii. 34. The Gadites seem, at the Conquest of the trans-Jordanic lands, to have been specially forward. For they appear, N. xxxii. 2, 6, 25, 29, 31, 33, at the head of the $2\frac{1}{2}$ tribes, who obtained that district, and they rebuilt cities not only in their own, but in the Reubenite territory, while the Reubenites confined themselves to their own land, N. xxxii. 34-36.

855. 'For there was the portion of the leader And he came as head of the people: He did the righteousness of Jehovah, And His judgments with Israel.'

Upon the above passage KNOBEL observes as follows:

The firstfruits of the Hebrew Conquest belonged to the 'leader'; and, since Gad showed at the head of the tribes a special activity and bravery, he therefore laid claim to that land, which, however, was only as good as something 'laid up' for him, since the regular possession could only begin after the fulfilment of the condition laid down by Moses, N. xxxii. 19.

At the head of the people, as foreman, fighting in advance, Gad marched with them into Canaan, D. iii. 18, N. xxxii. 17, 20-22, Jo. i. 14, iv. 12, and fulfilled what Jehovah had commanded as becoming and right, as a duty towards Israel.

The above explanation is not altogether satisfactory. But it is difficult, knowing so little as we do of the special history of the different tribes, to offer a better. This difficulty, however, is not at all removed by assigning the composition of the Song to Moses.

856. 'DAN is a young lion, That springs forth from Bashan (KNOB. the plain),' v. 22.

Dan seizes where one least expects him, falls upon the prey unawares, and grasps it. There may be a reference to the capture of Laish, Jo. xix. 47, Ju. xviii. 27; so G. xlix. 17, 'Dan shall be a serpent by the way, an adder in the path, that biteth the horse-heels, so that his rider shall fall backward.' 'Shenir' and 'Hermon' were in the district of Bashan, and we read, Sol. Song iv. 8, 'From the top of Shenir and Hermon, from the lions' dens, from the mountains of the leopards.' Zechariah also seems

to connect the 'oaks of Bashan,' xi. 2, with the 'roaring of the young lions' on the banks of the Jordan, v. 3.

857. 'NAPHTALI, be fat with favour, And full with the blessing of Jehovah! The sea (E.V. west) and the south do thou possess,' v. 23.

'Blessed with children be ASHER! May he be a source of pleasure to his brethren, And dipping his foot in oil!' v. 24.

'May thy bars [E.V. 'shoes'] be iron and brass, And as thy days thy rest (repose, security)!' v. 25.

KNOBEL, instead of 'bars' in the above, reads 'castles, forts,' and writes:—

'The Asherites lived as far as Lebanon, where mining was practised, and where they seem to have obtained metals, of which they may have made much use in strengthening their towns. And, in fact, they needed this in the midst of hostile people.'

858. In the concluding verses, v. 26-29, the greatness and glory of Jehovah are set forth, and the happy estate of Israel, under His protection and blessing, is described in glowing terms:—

'There is none like unto the God of Jeshurun, &c.'

'Israel then shall dwell securely, &c.'

'Happy art thou, O Israel! who is like unto thee?'

'O people saved by Jehovah! &c.'—

The following passages may be compared from the Prophet Jeremiah:

'There is none like unto Thee, Jehovah: Thou art great, and Thy Name is great in might.

Who would not fear Thee, O King of nations?

For to Thee doth it appertain: Forasmuch as among all the wise of the nations, and in all their kingdoms, There is none like unto Thee.' x. 6, 7.

'In his days Judah shall be saved, And Israel shall dwell securely.' xxiii. 6, xxxiii. 16.

859. KURTZ, iii. 492, remarks on D. xxxiii as follows:

We cannot fail to be struck with the fact, that the 'Blessing of Moses' does not contain the slightest trace of any special Messianic allusion, whereas they are so very prominent in that of Jacob, and, since his time, the Messianic expectations had been so greatly enlarged by the prophecy of the 'Star out of Jacob' and the 'Prophet like unto Moses.' But this may, perhaps, account sufficiently for the omission here. Since the time of Jacob, the Messianic expectation had advanced so far, that it had assumed the form of a belief in one single personal Messiah. But from which of the families or tribes the personal Messiah would spring was not yet known. The prophecy of Balaam, like that of Moses, had simply intimated that he would

spring out of the midst of Israel, and from the posterity of Jacob. It is true that even in G. xlix the tribe of Judah is distinguished above all the rest, as the one to which belonged the supremacy among the tribes. But there was something too indefinite in the description for the belief to take root in Israel, that from this particular tribe a personal Messiah would spring. This did not take place until the time of David. It might even be said that the distinction, conferred by 'Jacob's Blessing' upon the tribe of Judah, had fallen since then into the shade; for neither Moses, nor Aaron, nor Joshua, belonged to this tribe.

CHAPTER XXIII.

DEUT. XXXIV. 1-12.

*860. D. xxxiv. 1-3.

'And Moses went up from the plains of Moab unto the mountain of Nebo, to the top of Pisgah, that is over against Jericho; and Jehovah showed him all the land of Gilead unto Dan, and all Naphtali, and the land of Ephraim, and Manasseh, and all the land of Judah, unto the utmost sea, and the south, and the plain of the valley of Jericho, the city of palm-trees, unto Zoar.'

Here we have signs of a later writer in the mention of '*Dan*' (243), and '*all Naphtali*, and the land of *Ephraim*, and *Manasseh*, and all the land of *Judah*,'—where the different terms are used as well known, though the land was not yet divided. So we have 'unto this day,' v. 6.

SCOTT observes:—

The last chapter closed the words and writings of Moses, and this chapter must have been added by another hand; but it is uncertain whether by Joshua, or by Samuel, or by some other Prophet. Some, indeed, maintain that Moses himself wrote it by the spirit of prophecy; this, however, is not at all probable. But, by whomsoever it was written, the information must have been originally communicated by immediate revelation. Perhaps, the three last verses were added by Ezra; but all the subsequent books of Scripture assume as undoubted facts the things recorded in it.

861. These verses, v. 1-3, are plainly part of the older document, in continuation of xxxii. 52; and we have here the expression 'plains of Moab,' which is used exclusively by the older writer (523.xi), as also 'land of Gilead,' N. xxxii. 1, 29. In v. 1, however, we have the phrase 'over against Jericho,' which occurs also in the Deuteronomistic interpolation in xxxii. 49, whereas the older writer, whenever he introduces a similar reference to Jericho, employs invariably the form, 'on the

other side Jordan (near) Jericho,' or 'by Jordan (near) Jericho,'—in each case, the word 'Jericho' being used without any governing words, N. xxi. 1, xxvi. 3, 63, xxxi. 12, xxxiii. 48, 50, xxxiv. 15, xxxv. 1, xxxvi. 13. This suggests that the whole defining clause, 'the top of Pisgah that is over against Jericho,' is an insertion by the Deuteronomist.

862. D. xxxiv. 4-7.

'And Jehovah said unto him, This is the land which I swear unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, saying, I will give it unto thy seed; I have caused thee to see it with thine eyes, but thou shalt not go over thither. So Moses, the servant of Jehovah, died there, in the land of Moab, according to the word of Jehovah. And He buried him in a valley in the land of Moab, over against Bethpeor; but no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day. And Moses was an hundred and twenty years old, when he died; his eye was not dim, nor his natural force abated.'

This passage, again, belongs partly to the older document, though some part also is from the hand of the Deuteronomist, as is shown by the expression, v. 5, 6, 'land of Moab,' (523.i). Probably v. 4 is his entirely, and the two insertions 'land of Moab' in v. 5, 6, and the rest belongs to the older document (783).

863. D. xxxiv. 8, 9.

'And the children of Israel wept for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty days: so the days of weeping and mourning for Moses were ended. And Joshua, the son of Nun, was full of the spirit of wisdom: for Moses had laid his hands upon him; and the children of Israel hearkened unto him, and did as Jehovah commanded Moses.'

We have here the older writer, as appears by the expression, v. 8, 'plains of Moab,' (523.xi). Also the 'thirty days' of weeping correspond to those for Aaron, N. xx. 29; and the phrase 'as Jehovah commanded Moses,' v. 9, is constantly recurring in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers.

864. D. xxxiv. 10-12.

'And there arose not a Prophet since in Israel like unto Moses, whom Jehovah knew face to face, in all the signs and the wonders, which Jehovah sent him to do in the land of Egypt, to Pharaoh, and to all his servants, and to all his land, and in all that mighty hand, and in all the great terror, which Moses showed in the sight of all Israel.'

These words appear to belong to the Deuteronomist for these reasons:—

(1) v. 11, 'signs and wonders,' D. iv. 34, v. 22,

vii.19, xiii.1, 2, xxvi.8, xxviii.46, xxix.3, xxxiv.11, and also E.vii.3;

(ii) v.12, 'mighty hand,' D.iii.24, iv.34, v.15, vi.21, vii.8, 19, ix.26, xi.2, xxvi.8, xxxiv.12, and also E.iii.19, vi.1, 1, xiii.9, xxxii.11, N.xx.20;

(iii) 'terror,' iv.34, xi.25, xxvi.8, and also G.ix.2.

865. Upon the 'burial' of Moses xxxiv.6, KURTZ writes thus, iii.p.494:

'Moses died there,' says the scriptural account, 'according to the mouth—i.e. according to the word—of God.' The Rabbins render this 'at the mouth of God,' and call the death of Moses 'a death by a kiss.' Immediately afterwards it is stated that 'He buried him in the valley in the land of Moab.' Even if it were grammatically admissible to render the verb impersonally, ('they buried him,' LXX.) or to take the subject from the verb itself, 'he [one] buried him,' viz. 'whoever did bury him,' the context would not allow it but would still force us to the conclusion that Jehovah is the subject. The clause, 'and no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day,' unquestionably implies a peculiar mode of burial. The valley, in which Moses was buried, must have been a depression at the top of the mountains of Pisgah.

From the time of the Fathers, the answer given to the question, 'Why should Jehovah Himself have buried Moses?' has almost invariably been this, to prevent a superstitious or idolatrous veneration of his sepulchre or his remains. But, notwithstanding all the pious feelings of the nation, and their veneration of the greatest of all the Prophets of the O.T., such a result as this was certainly not to be apprehended at the time in question. The notions which prevailed, with reference to the defiling influence of graves and of the bodies of the dead,—notions which the Law had certainly only adopted, sanctioned, and regulated, and had not been the first to introduce,—were sufficiently powerful to guard against any such danger as this. Abraham's sepulchre was known to everybody. But it never entered the mind of any Israelite under the O.T. to pay idolatrous or even superstitious veneration to it, however nearly the reverence of later Jews for the person of Abraham might border upon superstition and idolatry. The remains of Jacob and Joseph were carried to Palestine, and buried there. But we cannot find the slightest ground for supposing that they were the objects of superstitious adoration.

866. KURTZ then attempts to account for this strange burial.

If Moses, therefore, was buried by Jehovah Himself, the reason must certainly have been, that such a burial was intended for him, as no one else could possibly have given. That there was something very peculiar in the burial of Moses, is sufficiently evident from the passage before us. And this is confirmed in a very remarkable manner by the N.T. history of the Transfiguration, where Moses and Elias appeared with the Redeemer. We may see here very clearly that the O.T. account may justly be understood, as imply-

ing that the design of the burial of Moses by the hand of Jehovah was to place him in the same category with Enoch and Elijah, to deliver him from going down into the grave like the rest of Adam's children, and to prepare for him a condition, both of body and soul, resembling that of those two men of God. It is true that Moses was not saved from death itself in the same manner as Enoch and Elijah; he really died, and his body was really buried; this is expressly stated in the Biblical history. But we may assume with the greatest probability, that, like them, he was saved from corruption. Men bury the corpse that it may see corruption. If Jehovah, therefore, would not suffer the body of Moses to be buried by men, it is but natural to seek for the reason of this in the fact, that He did not intend to leave him to corruption, but at the very time of his burial communicated some virtue by His own hand, which saved the body from corruption, and prepared for the Patriarch a transition into the same state of existence, into which Enoch and Elijah were admitted without either death or burial. The state of existence in the life beyond, into which Moses was introduced by the hand of Jehovah, was, probably, essentially the same as that into which Enoch was taken, when he was translated, and Elijah, when he was carried up to heaven, though the way was not to be the same. What the way may have been we can neither describe nor imagine. We are altogether in ignorance as to what the state itself was. The most that we can do is to form some conjecture of what it was not. For example, it was not one of absolute glorification and perfection, of which Christ alone could be the firstfruits, 1Cor.xv.20, 23; nor was it the dim 'sheol' life, into which all the other children of Adam passed. It was something between the two—a state as inconceivable as it had been hitherto unseen.

867. KURTZ goes on to say that he considers his view to be supported by the mention in Jude, v.9, of a conflict and dispute between the Archangel Michael and the Devil respecting the body of Moses. CLEM. ALEX. ORIGEN, and DIDYMUS, he says, speak of an apocryphal book entitled the 'Ascension or Assumption of Moses,' from which Jude took this story. But this he cannot allow: the author of that book and of Jude most probably drew from the same source—*tradition*,—and independently of each other. In short, he considers the Epistle of Jude to be 'canonical and written under the guidance of the Holy Spirit,' and that 'the adoption and use of this tradition in a canonical epistle gives it all the sanction of apostolical authority,' which means, in other words, that it is 'accredited by the Spirit of God.' When, therefore, it is said that He, Jehovah,

'buried him,' KURTZ understands it to mean that the 'Angel of Jehovah,' who was Jehovah's personal representative in all transactions with Israel in the wilderness, did so, and this 'Angel of Jehovah' he regards as identical with Michael the Archangel, and not with the Logos, as HENGSTENBERG does. In conclusion he adds—

The death of Moses was not like the death of the first Adam, which issued in corruption, nor was it like that of the second Adam, which was followed by a resurrection. It was rather something intermediate between the two forms of death, just as Moses himself occupied an intermediate position between the first and the second Adam,—between the head of sinful dying humanity, and the Head of humanity redeemed from sin.

868. We might embrace KURTZ's view in this quotation, if there was any ground for believing that this narrative contains an historically true account of the death and burial of Moses. But the above notes of KURTZ show to what extremities an honest mind must be driven in the attempt to recognise such a statement as infallibly true, and to realise it, as in that case we should be bound to do, in its details and consequences. There is no greater intellectual cowardice than to shrink from contemplating the results to which any tenet fairly leads, and so to profess a loose *general* belief, which we shrink from analysing in particulars.

CHAPTER XXIV.

RESULTS OF THE EXAMINATION OF DEUTERONOMY.

869. We have now completed the review of this Book, and, even if we had not previously proved the fact upon other grounds, the phenomena which we have here observed,—the contradictions, variations, and numerous indications of a more advanced state of civil and religious development,—would be sufficient to satisfy us that it must have been written in a different age from that in which the other four Books, generally, of the Pentateuch were written, and in a much later day.

870. If we now proceed to sum up the 'signs of time,' which we have observed in the course of our examina-

tion, we may state the conclusions to which they would lead us, as follows:—

(i) Deuteronomy was written after the Elohist and Jehovistic portions of the other four Books, since reference is made throughout to matters of fact related in them, and expressly to the laws about leprosy in xxiv.8.

(ii) Hence it was written after the times of Samuel and David; and this is further confirmed by the fact that the laws referring to the *kingdom* seem not to have been known to Samuel, 1S.viii.6-18, nor to the later writer of Samuel's doings.

(iii) The mention of the kingdom in xvii.14-20, with the distinct reference to the dangers likely to arise to the State from the king multiplying to himself 'wives,' and 'silver and gold,' and 'horses,' implies that it was written after the age of Solomon; and this is confirmed by the very frequent references to the 'place which Jehovah would choose,' that is, Jerusalem and the Temple.

(iv) The recognition of the independence of Edom carries down its composition to the time of their complete liberation from the control of the kings of Judah in the reign of Ahaz.

(v) It was written after the time of Hezekiah's Reformation, when the high places were removed, which the former kings of Judah, even the best of them, had freely permitted.

(vi) It was written *after* the Captivity of the Ten Tribes, in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign; since the sorrows of that event are evidently referred to as matters which were well known, but which now were things of the past.

(vii) It was written after the great spread in Judah, in Manasseh's time, of the worship of the 'Sun and Moon and the Host of Heaven.'

(viii) It was written *before* the time of Josiah's Reformation, since the words ascribed to Huldah expressly refer to it; and, indeed, there can be little doubt that this Book, whether alone or with the other Books, was that found in the Temple by Hilkiah, and was the direct cause of that Reformation.

(ix) Hence it can scarcely be doubted

that the Book of Deuteronomy was written, either in the latter part of Manasseh's reign, or in the early part of Josiah's.

871. EWALD, RIEHM, BLEEK, KUENEN, and others, are of opinion that the most probable supposition is that the book was written in the latter part of Manasseh's reign; DR WETTE, VON BOHLEN, KNOBEL, &c. (with whom we agree, for reasons which shall be presently stated), place its composition in the reign of Josiah. The difference in this point of detail is, of course, inconsiderable, and of no importance whatever with reference to the main question, whether or not this Book of Deuteronomy was written by Moses. The above able critics may vary within a limit of thirty or forty years in fixing the precise date of its composition; but they are all agreed in assigning it to the same later period of Jewish history. And this, indeed, may be ranked among the most certain results of modern scientific Biblical criticism.

872. RIEHM, p. 98-105, fixes the age of the Deuteronomist, with EWALD, in the latter half of Manasseh's reign, and writes as follows:—

In D.xxviii.68, among the punishments threatened to the people in case of their departing from Jehovah, *this* is threatened as the sorest and last—that Jehovah will carry them back to Egypt in ships, so that they would be sold there to their enemies into shameful and endless slavery. Hence it appears, *first*, that, in the time of the Deuteronomist, Egypt had become again so strong that he might expect the full destruction of the Israelitish State—not from the Assyrians (to whom v.36,48-50, refer.)—but from the Egyptians, and, *secondly*, since a removal in ships is threatened, that the Egyptians were at that time already powerful at sea. *Lastly*, it follows from the passage about the king, D.xvii.16, which forbids the king to 'cause the people to return to Egypt, to the end that he should multiply horses,' that at that time already the Egyptian kings sought and employed foreign soldiers; so that the Israelitish king could only obtain horses out of Egypt upon the condition that he, on his part, should send Israelitish foot-soldiers (comp. Is.xxxvi.8), and place them at the disposal of the Egyptian king. . . All this suits Egypt only during the reign of Psammetichus, but does not suit the state of Egypt before that reign. Certainly, we cannot maintain from ancient testimony that Psammetichus had a remarkable fleet. But, since he besieged Ashdod for twenty-nine years, (HEROD.ii.157,) he must have brought the troops which he marched thither, and

their supplies, not surely by the laborious land-journey, but by ships; and so it is not improbable that he possessed already a rather considerable navy, and that Pharaoh-Necho, of whom HERODOTUS tells us, ii.159, that he built two fleets, only carried on in this instance, as in others, his father's undertakings.

That, however, through Psammetichus the Egyptian kingdom, altogether weakened through internal dissension, and, as it seemed, tending to its fall, suddenly attained to new power, and raised itself to such might that it became very dangerous to its neighbours, and even, in course of time, was destructive to the Jews, 2K.xxiii.29, is well known. Since, however, at that time the Assyrian power, after the death of Esarhaddon II, was manifestly tending more and more to its end, while Babylon was not yet an independent mighty kingdom, our writer might probably expect the greater danger for the kingdom of Judah from the rejuvenescent Egyptian power, especially since the army of Psammetichus, which was besieging Ashdod, was in such threatening neighbourhood. That Psammetichus sought and employed strange soldiers, and particularly Arabians, we know from ancient authorities. If, therefore, at any time, the possibility existed of an alliance of the above kind between Judæa and Egypt, it existed in the time of Psammetichus. We must then, with EWALD, assume that Deuteronomy was written during the reign of Psammetichus, . . . in the latter half of the reign of Manasseh.

Who, however, was the author, it is impossible to say. The assumption of EWALD, that the author wrote in Egypt, 'in the presence of the unhappy people whom Manasseh had sold into Egypt,' rests upon no foundation, and is altogether improbable. . . . How could such a writer have laid down the command that all male Israelites should go up to the Temple at Jerusalem three times yearly? The untenable supposition, that Deuteronomy was written by Jeremiah, has already been copiously refuted [?] by KÖNIG, *A. T. Studien*, II. Justly also has EWALD protested against the groundless assumption, that the discoverer of the Law-Book, the High Priest Hilkiah, had himself composed Deuteronomy, but denied his authorship.

That the author must have been a very eminent man, in a spiritual point of view, is certain, and equally so that he, on one side, was well acquainted with the ancient legislation, and, on the other, was influenced by the writings of the earlier Prophets, and himself highly gifted with the prophetic spirit. And so one might, perhaps, assume that the author was a Priest, who, however, was at the same time conscious of a prophetic gift. More nearly to determine, is impossible without arbitrariness. That we do not know so great and very remarkable a man ought not to perplex us, since it is just the same with us in the case of the not less remarkable author of the second part of Isaiah, and since analogous phenomena are not wanting in the New-Testament literature, (e.g. Ep. to the Hebrews).

Ans. (i) The moral difficulty remains the

same whether Jeremiah, or any other eminent person, or 'prophetical Priest,' of those days wrote the Book of Deuteronomy.

(ii) It seems to us almost incredible that so great a writer as the Deuteronomist—evidently a master-mind, and a man of political as well as religious activity,—should have so completely disappeared from history, and left no other work of a similar kind behind him.

(iii) The case of the later Isaiah is not a parallel case, since he lived in the midst of the confusion and distress of the Captivity, of which no historical records have come down to us; whereas the Deuteronomist lived in a well-known age, of which distinct accounts are left to us, possibly by the hand of Jeremiah himself.

(iv) The Epistle to the Hebrews is still less a case in point, especially if written by ST. PAUL, since he left many other signs of his activity behind him. But many eminent writers lived in the time of this writer, whoever he may have been: whereas the Deuteronomist must have been almost the only writer of great eminence in his own age; and we cannot but suppose that so copious an author must have composed other writings, and that some of these would have come down to us.

(v) While admitting that the Book *may* have been written, as far as internal evidence shows, in the latter half of Manasseh's reign, yet it seems to us *more probable*, from the same internal evidence, that its author lived in a yet later age, perhaps in the earlier part of Josiah's time, for the following reasons:—

(a) The expressions in D.xxviii.49,50,—'Jehovah shall bring a nation against thee from far, from the end of the earth, as the eagle flieth, a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand, a nation of fierce countenance, &c.'—seem hardly to refer to the weak and sickly *Assyrian* power, 'manifestly tending more and more to its end,' but to the young and vigorous *Babylonian* kingdom; and this last, as RIEHM says, was not sufficiently developed till towards the end of Manasseh's days;

(b) We do not know for certain that Psammetichus had notable fleets; but we do know this of his son Pharaoh-Necho, who was reigning at the time when Josiah came to the throne;

(c) The Deuteronomist appears to have doubted from which of these two great powers the danger was most likely to come; which corresponds to the fact that 'Pharaoh-Necho, king of Egypt, went up against the king of Assyria (? the Babylonian power) to the river Euphrates,' on which occasion Josiah also went up,—apparently, to fight with the Egyptians,—and was killed, 2K.xxiv.29, in the thirty-ninth year of his life and the thirty-first of his reign;

(d) The 'book of the Law' was found in the eighteenth year of his reign, thirteen years before; and previously to that time Josiah seems to have been on friendly terms with Egypt, Jer.ii.18,36, and, perhaps, was lending soldiers, and obtaining horses, in the very way condemned in D.xvii.16. It is probable that this very language of Deuteronomy, or rather (as we suppose) the remonstrances of

the living Deuteronomist, may have produced this change of relations, which ended, however, fatally for the young king.

(vi) We shall consider fully in the proper place the *negative* arguments of KÖNIG, as well as the *positive* indications, however strong or weak, of JEREMIAH's authorship.

873. The following argument, however, tends strongly (in our opinion) to fix the composition of Deuteronomy in the early years of Josiah.

If it really was written in Manasseh's time, we are then met by the following difficulties. In that case, the author may have placed it in the Temple in Manasseh's lifetime, without the knowledge of anyone, which of course is conceivable. But then he must have gone his way, *leaving so valuable a fruit of so much labour to the chances of the future*,—or, we may say, to the overruling of Providence,—without communicating to anyone the fact of its existence. And, further, he must have died without betraying the secret,—without showing any personal interest in the success of his great enterprise, or caring to see any result of it in his own days,—nay, without even making any provision against the possibility of the Book itself being neglected, destroyed, or lost, while it lay unknown and unheeded in the Temple, during the latter portion of Manasseh's idolatrous reign. For we take no account of the Chronicler's story of Manasseh's repentance, 2Ch.xxxiii.18,19, of which the Book of Kings says nothing.

874. Or, if the writer himself survived the reign of Manasseh, and the short reign of Amon, and so was living in the early years of Josiah,—or if any one was then living to whom the writer, before his death, *had* communicated his secret,—it seems very difficult to account for the long and total silence with respect to the existence of this Book, which was maintained during *seventeen* years of Josiah's reign, when the king's docile piety and youth would have encouraged the production of such a Book, if it really existed, and there was such imperative necessity for that Reformation to be begun as soon as possible, with a view to which the Book itself was written.

875. Thus it seems to us, on the

above grounds only, *most* reasonable to suppose that the book was *in process of composition* during these first seventeen years of Josiah's reign. The youth of the prince—his piety—his willingness to follow the teaching of the Prophets around him—gave every encouragement for such an attempt being made to bring about the great change that was needed. Possibly some years of Josiah's reign had passed before the work was begun, though we can scarcely doubt that it must have taken some time for its completion. Still two or three years, at most, might suffice for this. And during that interval, however short or long, we may conceive insertions to have been made from time to time, as fresh ideas occurred to the writer; and thus we may account, in some measure, for the numerous repetitions of the same sentiment, by which the book is characterised.

876. But who was the writer? As KNOBEL observes—

The author seems to have been an *eminent* man, who took upon himself to make so free with the Law-Book.

Independently of this 'free handling' of the earlier records, the man who could conceive, and carry out so effectively, the idea of adding another book to the existing Tetrateuch, must have been, indeed, a remarkable person. A writer of such originality, power, and eloquence,—of such earnest piety, such ardent patriotism, such tender human affections,—must have surely filled a very prominent position in the age in which he lived. As we have said, he can hardly have disappeared so completely from the stage of Jewish history, in an age when historical records were diligently kept, without leaving behind any other trace of his existence and activity than this Book of Deuteronomy. That *Jeremiah* lived in this very age we know, and that he began to prophesy 'in the thirteenth year of king Josiah,' Jer.i.2, four or five years before this Book was found in the Temple. And we have also seen, as our investigations have advanced, not a few very striking indications of a close resemblance between the language of *Jeremiah* and that of the Deuteronomist.

May it be that the two writers are identical,—that among the prophecies of *Jeremiah*, during the first five years of his labours, may be reckoned the addresses, which are here delivered under the name of *Moses*?

CHAPTER XXV.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

877. As the result of the preceding investigations, it must, as we think, be admitted that the traditional belief, that the whole Pentateuch, with a few unimportant exceptions, was written by *Moses* himself, can no longer be maintained in face of the plain facts of the case, as they lie before us in this volume. These facts, it would seem; compel us to this conclusion, that, whatever portion of the other four Books may have been actually composed by the hand of *Moses*,—whatever of the laws and ceremonies contained in them may have been handed down from the Mosaic age,—yet certainly the Book of Deuteronomy was *not* written by him, but is the product of a much later time, and bears the distinct impress of that time and its circumstances.

878. And, if this be so, we cannot serve God by wilfully shutting our eyes to the truth, and walking still in darkness, when He is pleased to give us light. It would be no acceptable worship of Him, who is the very Truth, to do so: it would be sinful and displeasing in His Sight. We are bound to obey the Truth, which we see and know, and to follow it whithersoever it may lead us,—calm in the assurance that, in so following, we are best doing the blessed Will of our Heavenly Father, that His Voice will cheer and strengthen us, His Hand lead on and uphold us, and we shall know sufficiently all that we need to know, for this life and for the life to come. Only we must be 'strong and of good courage'; we must fear no evil, since He is with us, but go straightforward at His Word in the path of duty.

879. Unless, therefore, the evidence, which has here been produced, can be set aside by reasonable argument, we must accept it henceforth, as a matter

of fact,—which is now, perhaps, to many made plain for the first time, though long well-known to a few scholars here in England, and to very many on the Continent,—that, whatever may be true of the rest of the Pentateuch, the Book of Deuteronomy, at all events, was not the work of Moses. We must accept this, I repeat, with all its important consequences.

880. And yet this Book it is, and this alone, of which the authorship is actually claimed for Moses. We find mention made in the other Books of his 'writing' on several occasions: *e.g.*—

'And Jehovah said unto Moses, Write this for a memorial in a book, and rehearse it in the ears of Joshua,' E.xvii.14;

'And Moses wrote all the words of Jehovah . . . and he took the book of the covenant, and read in the audience of the people,' E.xxiv.4-7;

'And Jehovah said unto Moses, Write thou these words: for after the tenor of these words I have made a covenant with thee and with Israel,' E.xxxiv.27;

'And Moses wrote their goings out according to their journeys by the commandment of Jehovah,' N.xxxiii.2.

From such passages it might be fairly argued, (though it certainly is not distinctly stated,) that other portions also of these Books, besides those to which direct reference is made in the above quotations,—perhaps the main portions of them,—are, of course, to be regarded as also the work of Moses.

881. But that, which can only be inferred in the case of these Books, is expressly asserted with respect to Deuteronomy. Not only are we told, D.xxxi.22, that Moses 'wrote' the Song, which we find recorded in D.xxxii, but the writing of the whole Book or, at least, of the principal portion of it, is plainly ascribed to him in D.xxxi. 9-11:—

'And Moses wrote this Law, and delivered it unto the Priests the sons of Levi. . . . And Moses commanded them saying, At the end of every seven years, in the solemnity of the year of release, in the Feast of Tabernacles, when all Israel is come to appear before Jehovah thy God in the place which He shall choose, thou shalt read this Law before all Israel in their hearing.'

882. But this Book also it is, in point of fact, which forms, so to speak, the most living portion, the very sum and substance, of the whole Pentateuch.

When we speak of the 'Law of Moses,' we mean chiefly the Book of Deuteronomy. And we cannot but remember that it is this Book also, which is quoted again and again, with special emphasis, in the New Testament: *e.g.*—

'He answered and said, It is written, Thou shalt not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God,' Matt.iv.4;

'Jesus said unto him, It is written again, Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God,' v.7.

'Then saith Jesus unto him, Get thee hence, Satan! for it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and Him only shalt thou serve,' v.10.

Here we have quotations from D.viii. 3, vi.16, vi.13, x.20. And it is well known that there are many other passages in the Gospels and Epistles, in which this Book is referred to, and in some of which Moses is expressly mentioned as the writer of the words in question, *e.g.* Acts.iii.22, Rom.x.19. And though it is true that, in the texts above quoted, the words are not, indeed, ascribed to Moses, but are merely introduced with the phrase, 'It is written,' yet in Matt. xix.7 the Pharisees refer to a passage in Deut.xxiv.1 as a law of Moses, and our Lord in His reply, v.8, repeats their language, and practically adopts it as correct, and makes it His own.

883. When, however, such words as the above are quoted from Deuteronomy, are they the less true—have they less binding power upon the conscience—because they were written by some later prophet, and not by Moses? Are they true *only* because they are 'written' in this 'Book of the Law'? Are they not rather true, because they are true in themselves, by whomsoever written or spoken,—eternally and unchangeably true,—and, as such, come home at once, with living power and authority, to the hearts and consciences of living men?

884. It is 'written' in the Bible,—

'Truly the light is sweet, and a pleasant thing it is for the eyes to behold the sun,' Eccl.xi.7.

But is the light sweet to our eyes *because* it is thus stated in the Bible—by Solomon, as is generally believed, writing under Divine inspiration? Or would it be less sweet, if the results of

modern criticism should show that the Book of Ecclesiastes, though ascribed to the 'Son of David, king in Jerusalem,' Eccl.i.1, was not written by Solomon, but by some unknown author long after the Captivity? Is not the light sweet to our eyes, because our gracious God and Father has made the Sun, and given us our visual powers, that we may open our eyes and they shall be filled with light, and we shall behold the glorious beauty of His universe?

885. And is the Light of Truth only sweet to us—does it only exist for us—because we find the bright reflection of it in the Bible? Is it not rather joy for us to know that God's Truth exists eternally, and shines like the Sun in the spiritual heavens, and we, His children upon earth, have a spiritual sense and spiritual eyesight given us, to which this Light of the inner man is 'sweet,' by which we can 'behold' its brightness,—whether it comes to us direct from the 'Father of Lights' in some moment of blessed inspiration, or shines upon us as reflected from the pages of the Bible, or, rather, as *refracted* through the human media, by which in the Bible the 'Word of God' is given to us?

886. For will it be any longer maintained, in this age of scientific enlightenment, that all our 'hopes for eternity' depend upon every 'line' of the Bible being vouched by Divine authority as infallibly true? Is the statement, that 'the hare chews the cud,' to be received as true, because written down in Leviticus and Deuteronomy? Or would it have become true, if quoted, as it might have been, in the New Testament, as part of the 'Law of Moses'? No one, surely, with the known facts of science before him, will hesitate to give the answer to *such* a question.

887. But, if we are obliged to allow that some portions of the teaching of the Bible cannot be regarded as having Divine authority,—as being 'faithful' and 'trustworthy' statements, 'infallibly true,'—because they contradict the known facts of science, there are surely others which we must equally reject, because they are at variance, with the laws of our moral being, because they

conflict at once with the plain lessons of the Gospel, and with those eternal principles of right and wrong, which the Great Creator has planted within us, in respect of which it is specially true that man is made 'in the image,' and 'after the likeness,' of God.

887. Must we not feel, for instance, that the Eternal Law of Justice and Equity, which God himself has written with His own Finger upon the tables of our hearts, is directly at variance with such commands as these quoted below,—that *these* cannot, at all events, be regarded as utterances of the blessed Will of God,—that the writer or them, though an inspired man, cannot certainly have written *thus* by Divine inspiration? *e.g.*—

(i) D.xiii.1, which excludes from the congregation of Jehovah one mutilated, perhaps in helpless infancy; while those, by whose agency the act in question was encouraged or, perhaps, performed, are allowed free access to the Sanctuary;

(ii) D.xiii.2, which excludes in like manner an innocent base-born child, but takes no account of the vicious parent;

(iii) D.xi.18-21, which commands that a 'stubborn and rebellious son' shall be stoned to death, when oftentimes the father and mother, who by their bad example had corrupted, or by their faulty training had ruined, their child, deserved rather to suffer punishment;

888. So, too, D.xx.10-15 orders that any city of any distant people, with whom Israel might be at war, shall first be summoned to surrender; and, if it will make no peace on condition of *all the people becoming tributaries and doing service to Israel*, shall then be besieged, and with Divine help captured; and then it is written—

'When Jehovah thy God hath delivered it into thine hands, thou shalt smite every male thereof with the edge of the sword: but the women and the little ones, and the cattle, and all that is in the city, even all the spoil thereof, shalt thou take unto thyself; and thou shalt eat the spoil of thine enemies, which Jehovah thy God hath given thee. Thus shalt thou do unto all the cities which are very far off from thee, which are not of the cities of these nations.'

'But of the cities of these people, which Jehovah thy God doth give thee for an inheritance, thou shalt save alive nothing that breatheth; but thou shalt utterly destroy them, the Hittites and the Amorites, the Canaanites and the Perizzites, the Hivites and the Jebusites, as Jehovah thy God hath commanded thee; that they teach you not to do after all their abominations, which they have done unto their gods: so should ye sin against Jehovah your God.'

889. Such laws as the above are felt at once to be directly contradictory to those first principles of humanity and equity, which God our Creator has planted within us, to be our monitors and guides through life; and they equally contradict the plainest teaching of the Gospel of Christ. I have explained how the writer may be justly relieved from the reproach of having set on record such sanguinary laws as these, with any idea of their being really carried out. The 'rebellious son' is only a figure of 'rebellious Israel'; and the judgment denounced against his disobedience shadows forth the penalty deserved by those who will not 'obey the voice of Jehovah,' their Heavenly Father. And so, too, the last of the above laws simply expresses the burning zeal which glowed within him against the idolatrous practices, human sacrifices, impurities, &c. which were then common among his own people, and which they had adopted either from the Canaanite nations of former days, or more probably from the heathen tribes then living around them.

90. The Prophet here makes use of the tribes of Canaan as a standing type of such idolators. In the age of Josiah, when these words were written down, those tribes, we may believe, no longer existed: they had long disappeared, or been merged in the Israelitish people. The history teaches us that they never were exterminated,—that 'Uriah the Hittite' served as a captain in David's army, and 'Araunah the Jebusite' had his threshing-floor on the site of the future Temple at Jerusalem. But the Deuteronomist, by setting forth before his people the figure of these tribes, driven out from their old abodes as a judgment for their sins, and ruthlessly exterminated by the hands of Jehovah's worshippers, seeks to remind the latter

of their duty and of their danger—of the terrible woe of expatriation, and even extermination, which would be their just recompense, if they, too, practised the like abominations. The command to slay the men of a distant city, and to save the women and children, &c. alive, is probably introduced by way of contrast to the other more terrible command, and not with any view of its being really executed. And, indeed, in Josiah's time there was little probability of any such distant conquests being made by Israel.

891. In such a way as this we can explain intelligibly the fact, that even a good man, a lover of justice and mercy, an inspired Prophet, could yet write down such laws as these. But it is surely nothing else than a tampering with the truth,—an unintentional, doubtless, but yet a real, dishonesty,—and therefore, if done with a religious motive, only (disguise it as we will) an idolatrous worship, of a God, who is not our God, the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the very God of Truth,—if we endeavour to defend such laws as these as truly and infallibly Divine, and really uttered from the Mouth of the Most Holy and Blessed One, on the principle that—not a mere man like Moses, but—the Divine Being Himself was compelled to adapt His laws to an imperfect state of society,—'to preconceived and popular ideas,'—and, therefore, was led to utter commands, which a child instructed in the first lessons of the Gospel,—nay, which a heathen walking in that Light, which 'lighteneth every man that cometh into the world,'—can at once condemn as unjust and inhuman.

892. We must, then, even in reading the Scriptures, 'try the spirits, whether they are of God.' In this way only can we do the Will of God, and discharge the true duty, and rise to the true dignity, of man as the child of God. We might wish, perhaps,—many do wish,—to have it otherwise, to be able to fall back upon the notion of an Infallible Book, or an Infallible Church. But God has not willed it so. He will not give us,—at least He has not given

us,—a Revelation of such a kind, as to relieve us from the solemn duty of judging, each for himself, what is right and true in His Sight. His Spirit has quickened us, that we may do, as living men, His work in the world. He will not suffer us to abdicate the glorious office to which He calls us. We *must*—not only claim and exercise the *right*, but—bear the *responsibility* of private judgment, upon the things of the life to come, as well as of this world.

893. The Deuteronomist himself will teach us this lesson. He tells us, indeed, that God in all ages will raise up prophets like unto ourselves, xviii.18, will kindle His Fire within the heart, and put His Words into the mouth, of men, who, in all the weakness of humanity, shall speak to their fellow-men all that they feel commanded to teach in His Name,—who shall utter His Eternal Truth, and minister to their brethren the lessons of 'doctrine, reproof, correction, instruction in righteousness.' And their brethren shall 'hear' them; they dare not neglect the truth, of whatever kind, which God's own grace imparts and brings home to them from the lips of a fellow-man, however high or humble.

894. But they must not listen to him with a blind unreasoning acquiescence, though He speak to them in the name of Jehovah, and though the 'sign or wonder' come to pass, xiii.2, which he brought to them as the very credentials of his mission. They must 'try the spirit' of the Prophet's words by that law which they have within them, written upon their hearts. Jehovah, their God, is proving them, to know whether they truly and entirely love Him, and love His Truth, 'with all their heart, and with all their soul.' If the words, which that Prophet speaks to them, come home to their consciences as right and true words, then in God's Name let them acknowledge and welcome them, and send them on with a blessing of 'God speed!' to others. If the Voice, which speaks within, declares that the utterance from without is false, then 'shalt thou not hearken,' xiii.3, the word is not God's, and he who hears must *not* obey it.

895. In this spirit we must read the Book of Deuteronomy itself, and we shall find the Living Bread which our souls may feed on,—we shall find in it the Word of God. And that Word will *not* be at variance with the eternal and essential substance of Christianity, with those words which 'shall not pass away.' Then we shall live no more in constant fear, that some rude stroke of criticism may shake, perhaps, the 'very foundations of our faith,' or that the announcement of some simple fact of science or natural history may threaten 'to take from us our nearest and dearest consolations.' We shall learn thus to have 'faith in God,' as our Lord has bidden us, Mark xi.22, and not in the written records, through which He has been pleased, by inspiring the hearts of our brother-men with life, to quicken and comfort our own. When we hear such words as these—

'Man doth not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God doth man live,' D.viii.3—

'Thou shalt also consider in thy heart that, as a man chasteneth his son, so the Living God, thy God, doth chasten thee,' D.viii.5—

'If from thence,—from the very depth of sin-wrought misery,—thou shalt seek the Living God, thy God, thou shalt find Him, if thou seek Him with all thy heart and with all thy soul,' D.iv.29—

we shall joyfully welcome them as messages of truth, not merely because we find them in the Bible but because they are true—eternally true.

896. It is true that God loves us as dear children, and that we may go to Him at all times, as to a wise and tender Father, with a childlike trust and love, as with a childlike reverence and fear. Rather, we *must* go to Him thus if we would please Him, and act in the spirit of those words, which have taught us all to say, 'Our Father.' We must believe, not only that He is 'loving unto every man,' and 'His tender mercies are over all His works,' but that that deep love, which human parents feel, is a true reflection of His Great Love,—is *meant* to image forth to us, however faintly, the Love of Him who is the Father of us all. 'He that planted the ear,' says the Psalmist, 'shall He not hear? He that formed the eye, shall He not see? He that

teacheth man knowledge, shall He not know?' Ps.xciv.9,10, and we may add for our consolation, 'He that teacheth man to love, shall He not love?'

897. This truth, then, we must 'consider in our hearts' that He, who has planted in our breasts, as parents, dear love to our children, a love stronger than death, does by that very love of ours *intend* to shadow forth to us His own Eternal Love. Our love, we know, can take in every child of the family: *our* hearts can find a place for all; yes, and our love embraces the far-off prodigal, in his miserable wanderings, no less surely, and no less tenderly, than the dear obedient child that sits by our side, rejoicing in the sweet delights of home. He that has taught us to love our children in this way, how shall He not also love His children,—love us and love ours,—with a love in which the separate loves of earthly parents are blended, and find their full infinite expression,—the Father's loving wisdom and firmness, to guide and counsel, and, if need be, to correct and chasten,—the Mother's tender pity and compassion, that will draw near with sweet consolations, in each hour of sorrow and suffering, will sympathise with every grief and trial, will bow down to hear each shame-stricken confession, will be ready to receive the first broken words of penitence, and whisper the promise of forgiveness and peace?

898. Ah! truly, the little child may cling to its mother's neck, and the mother's love will feel the gentle pressure, and will delight to feel it: but it is not the feeble clinging of the little one that holds it up; it is the strong arm of love that embraces it. And we, in our most earnest prayers and aspirations, in our cleaving unto God, in our longing and striving after Truth, are but as babes, 'stretching out weak hands of faith' to lay hold of Him Whom no man hath seen or can see, but Who, unseen, is ever near us, Whose tender Love embraces all His children—those

that are far off as well as those that are near, the heathen and the Christian, the sinner and the Saint.

899. Happy, indeed, are we, who are blessed to know this—to know the high calling and the glorious privileges of the children of God! Not that we may be more *safe* than others, who as yet know it not, but that we may be filled with hope and strength and courage in the assurance of this Truth,—that we may be more living and earnest and joyful in our work,—more brave to speak the Truth, to do the Right, to wage eternal war with all that is false and base and evil, within us and without,—more patient in suffering,—more firm and true in temptation and trial,—more sorrowful and ashamed when we have fallen,—more quick to rise, and go on again, in the path of duty, with tears and thankgivings,—more eager to tell out the Love of God to others, whether to those who as yet are groping, 'if haply they may feel after Him and find Him,' Who 'is not far from any one of them,' 'in Whom they live and move and have their being,' or to those who *have* known Him, but know no longer now the joy of His children, 'sitting in darkness and in the shadow of death, fast bound in misery and iron.'

900. But, in all this, it is not our knowledge, however clear, or our faith, however firm and orthodox, or our charity, however bright or pure, that holds us up daily, and binds us to the Bosom of our God. 'Our Father' will delight in all the sacred confidences of His children,—their clings of faith and hope,—their longings of pure desire for a closer sense of His Presence,—their holy aspirations and penitential confessions. But it is not our prayer that will hold us up; it is His Love alone which does this.

'THE ETERNAL GOD IS OUR REFUGE, AND UNDERNEATH ARE THE EVERLASTING ARMS.' D.xxxiii.27.

THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENZO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of, facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'

Quarterly Review on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

PART IV.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1865.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	277
I. THE COMPOSITE CHARACTER OF THE PENTATEUCH	293
II. ANALYSIS OF GEN.I.1—IV.26.	294
III. ANALYSIS OF GEN.V.1—VII.24.	296
IV. ANALYSIS OF GEN.VIII.1—XI.26.	299
V. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ELOHIST AND JEHOVIST	302
VI. THE ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC PASSAGES IN GEN.I.1—XI.26.	305
VII. GENERAL REMARKS ON THE RELATION OF SCRIPTURE AND SCIENCE	312
VIII. GEN.I.1—II.3.	316
IX. LEGENDS OF THE CREATION AMONG OTHER NATIONS	324
X. GEN.II.4—II.25.	328
XI. GEN.III.1—III.24.	333
XII. STORIES OF PARADISE AND THE FALL IN OTHER NATIONS	341
XIII. GEN.IV.1—V.32.	343
XIV. THE BOOK OF ENOCH	347

Truth, throughout her whole domain, illimitable as is its extent, is one in principle and harmonious in details. It is no other than the having our conceptions in accordance with the reality of things. And Truth in expression (= Veracity) is the adapting of our language, written or spoken, to the honest utterance of our conceptions. . . . An assertion cannot be true in Theology, and false in Geology, or any department of scientific knowledge; nor inversely. It really is an insult to men's understandings, to admit indirectly that there are affirmations or doctrines in the records of revealed religion, which are disproved by the clearest evidence of Science, and then to proscribe investigation, with a solemn pretence of mysteries not to be inquired into, an hypocritical tone of reverence for sacred things. The veil is transparent: no man can be deceived by it: but it is lamentable that any should attempt to deceive by it. . . . True Theology, on the contrary, attracts to itself, illustrates, and harmonises, all other knowledge. It is the science which relates to the Author and Preserver of the whole dependent Universe,—whatever may be known concerning Him, for the noblest purposes of intellectual improvement, of personal virtue, and of diffusive happiness. . . . It is the friend of all Science: it appropriates all Truth: it holds fellowship with no error.—DR. PYE SMITH, *Geology and Science*, p.452.

PREFACE TO PART IV.

I HAVE explained in the body of this Part of my work the reasons which have determined me to confine myself at present to the examination of the First Eleven Chapters of Genesis, reserving to the next Part the consideration of the remaining Chapters, and the discussion, which may then be raised, as to the respective ages of the Elohist and Jehovistic writers.

I have great hope that the *clearness* and *certainly*, with which the two principal writers of Genesis can be distinguished in these first Chapters, will bring conviction to many, who have hitherto only had misgivings upon the question, or, perhaps, have turned aside from these criticisms altogether, as being in their view too abstruse and uncertain,—and will satisfy them that there is, indeed, truth in the statement, which I have so often repeated, and which, in fact, is the very core and centre of this controversy, *viz.* that the Pentateuch is not in its present form the work of Moses,—or not exclusively his work,—but a *composite* work by different writers of different ages. Here lies the gist of the whole question, however the details, as to the assignment of particular passages, or the exact age of the different writers, may be ultimately settled.

I have shown in Chap. I-VII that these First Eleven Chapters of Genesis are made up of two documents, in very nearly equal proportions, and that one of these,—that containing the first account of the creation in G.i,—forms, when its different parts are put together a complete unbroken narrative. With respect to the other, it must be left doubtful at present, whether it was originally also a complete narrative which has been combined with the former, with the suppression of some clauses, by the hand of a later editor, or whether it was merely intended from the first to be supplementary, and so exhibits only the additions which have been made by a later writer to the primitive story. In any case, we have here the compositions of two writers, not only distinct, but in some points actually at variance with each other, even within the limits of these few Chapters.

The accuracy and cogency of the above analysis may be easily

tested by the English reader, though unacquainted with Hebrew, if he will only follow carefully the course of reasoning pursued in one or two sections, with an English Bible in his hand, in which he has marked the Jehovistic passages by a line drawn down the margin. Many, I believe, will be more satisfied, as to the main facts of the case, by the consideration of this kind of *internal* evidence, than by any arguments from *without*, such as those based upon the contradictions which may be shown to exist between many of the statements, in these ancient accounts of the Creation and the Deluge, and the results of Science. Here, however, the facts are, for any who are willing to look at them, and they cannot, I believe, in the main be gainsaid.

But having completed this portion of the work, and thereby established, as I conceive, the right and duty, for myself and for every minister of God's Truth, to examine seriously, and yet freely, the actual contents of these chapters, with the desire to know what they really contain, I have exercised this right, and have endeavoured to discharge this duty, to the best of my power. The result of my examination I have laid before the reader in the last chapters of this Part, and have proved abundantly, as I believe, that the statements of both the Elohist and Jehovist, in these First Eleven Chapters of Genesis,—whatever value they may have, whatever religious lessons may be drawn from them,—cannot be regarded as historically true, being contradicted in their literal sense, again and again, by the certain facts of modern Science. I trust that by both divisions of my labour in this Fourth Part,—which is complete in itself, and needs not any help from the arguments and criticisms in the preceding portions of my work,—I shall have done something to relieve the cause of Science itself, and the speculations of devout and earnest scientific men, from the charges so often made in former days—made even recently by more than one Bishop of the Church of England—of being injurious to religion, and dishonouring to the Word of God. I shall have done this by showing that the injury and dishonour are not to be charged upon *them*, but upon those who will still insist on teaching that the mere letter of every part of Scripture is to be regarded as the authoritative, infallible, Word of the Living God.

In discussing the questions raised by the examination of these Chapters, I have, as before, availed myself frequently of the language of others, instead of expressing the very same thing in my own words. I have done this, both because I have felt it to be due to those eminent critics, who have led the way in these inquiries, to give them the credit of research and originality, while making use of their stores of learning,—and, in doing this, it seemed more desirable, for the satisfaction of the reader, to produce their

actual words, than merely to refer to them by name,—and because, in the case of (so-called) orthodox writers, I preferred to make use of their statements and admissions, as being free from the imputation of having been possibly influenced by a desire to support my own side of the argument.

I should, indeed, have desired, if it had been possible, to have had recourse for this purpose to some eminent living authority of the Church of England. But I am not aware that any of the existing Bishops or Doctors of the English Church has published any work of importance, connected with the criticism of the Pentateuch. There was, however, one distinguished Prelate of our Church, whom death has only lately removed from us, Archbishop WHATELY of Dublin, to whom a tract has been publicly ascribed—and he has not (I believe) disowned it—bearing upon questions in the second, third, and eleventh Chapters of Genesis. This tract was published anonymously in 1849, and, being written in Latin, is little known to English readers. I translate from it the following passage on the ‘Tower of Babel’:—

G.xi.1-10. This short narrative in the Book of Genesis labours under great difficulties.

(i) If we look at the design of those, who attempted to build, in order that they might not be scattered abroad, how was that to be effected by the help of a very high tower? And what dispersion was either to be *feared* by them or *avoided*, since, it would seem, it was permitted to each to choose his own place of abode?

(ii) Let us consider the mode of frustrating their purpose. It is believed that a great multitude of men, through a wonderful change, forgot their ancestral tongue, and spoke suddenly a new language. This would be a great miracle, and yet would not conduce to the end proposed. For, unless they are supposed to have been struck out of their senses by the prodigy, they would have been able to continue their work after a very short inconvenience. Any architect, set over workmen of different tongues, would, in a short time, be able to impart his orders by means of signs: and in the space of a few days they would have learned enough of his words, to be able to go on together, their labours being joined, with continually diminishing difficulty. Besides, when the project of building was dismissed, why was it necessary that they should be all scattered very widely through all regions? How many countries also are inhabited by races speaking different tongues, *e.g.* Wales, Scotland, Ireland, many parts of the East Indies?

This granted, the whole matter may have taken place thus. Some chief men had determined to found an empire, which should embrace the whole human race. That this empire might have the sanction of religion, they wished to found a temple, dedicated to some idol, in that city which was to be the head of the world. Since it was not in the power of these men, living in the plain, to place that building on a mountain, (which custom afterwards prevailed, as the passages in Scripture testify, which speak everywhere of ‘high places,’) therefore they determined to erect a very high tower, like an artificial mountain. Such a purpose of founding a false religion could not but be displeasing to the True and Living God. He, therefore, entirely frustrated their impious design, by throwing discord into the minds of the ambitious founders. He made them to quarrel about religious worship, by which dissension He would much more certainly vitiate their attempt, than by a diversity of tongues. History abounds in examples of such dissension: we may mention the Jews and Samaritans, Pharisees and Karaites, and, lastly, the various sects of Christians. Thus it came to pass at Babel, that the strongest of the factions kept possession of the city and tower, only dropping the magnitude of the tower and that height which they had originally intended, while the other factions went off in different directions, and settled themselves, some in one locality, some in another.

But as so much stress had been laid upon the writings of Archbishop USSHER and Bishop WATSON of former days, I thought it my duty to refer to them again, while engaged in the consideration of these questions. I was, of course, well aware that their works

would throw not a single ray of light upon the *critical* difficulties, which have arisen in this controversy. But, as it had been publicly asserted, on very high authority, that my objections to the accuracy of the Pentateuch, in historical and scientific matters,—have been again and again refuted, two hundred years ago by Archbishop USSHER, more recently by Bishop WATSON and others,—

I took for granted that upon the points, most likely to be discussed in the last chapters of this Part,—leaving out of consideration the critical analysis,—I should certainly find some important observations in these works, some remarks which I should be bound to consider well, and either to allow or to refute.

To my great surprise, after the distinct and pointed reference made to them, I find in these writers nothing, or next to nothing, of this kind. Archbishop USSHER deals almost entirely with matters of *chronology*, with which my books are very little concerned. Bishop WATSON scarcely discusses at length a single important point of those, which I have raised in my different volumes. And the most decisive of all his attempts to clear up a difficulty is with reference to the introduction of the name of the town Dan, which I have dwelt upon in (II. 230-233.) He first suggests that the passages in question, G.xiv.14, D.xxxiv.1, as well as G.xxxvi.31, may be 'interpolations,' and he then adds, p.205 :—

But if this solution does not please you, I desire it may be proved that the Dan mentioned in Genesis was the same town as that mentioned in Judges. [This is admitted by such strong defenders of the traditional view as KURTZ and DELITZSCH, —by the former, after having maintained at one time the contrary.] I desire further to have it proved, that the Dan mentioned in Genesis was the name of a *town*, and not of a *river*. It is merely said, Abraham pursued them, the enemies of Lot, to Dan. Now a river was full as likely as a town to stop a pursuit. Lot, we know, was settled in the plain of *Jordan*; and Jordan, we know (!), was composed of the united streams of two rivers, called *Jor* and *Dan*.

I need hardly say that such reasoning, which might be allowed to pass in the days of Bishop WATSON, would not be accepted, as of any value whatever, in our own days. The rivers 'Jor' and 'Dan' are not mentioned in the Bible, and their existence is not, I believe, recognised in the geography of Palestine. Mr. Ffoulkes writes,—

It has been well observed that the Hebrew word *Yarden*, = 'Jordan,'—has no relation whatever to the name 'Dan,' and also that the river had borne that name from the days of Abraham, and from the days of Job, at least five centuries before the name of 'Dan' was given to the city at its source.—SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, p. 1129.

But, having been referred in this manner to the works of Bishop WATSON, as writings of great authority,—and, indeed, since, for more than a quarter of a century, he was Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge, he may be considered to have spoken, in ecclesiastical matters, with the weight of professorial learning, as well as with that of episcopal authority,—I have consulted those works, and have found some passages, which deserve, I think, consideration under present circumstances. For instance, the following extracts, from his 'Life,' will show what views he

held on one particular point, to which attention is strongly drawn at the present time,—namely, the liberty of private judgment, as asserted by our Protestant Church, and secured to every Minister in the very terms of the Ordination Service. It will be seen that, in reference to the Creeds, Bishop WATSON held that they were ‘all of human fabrication,’ and might be used or disused at pleasure in public worship, being merely venerable documents, which expressed the ancient belief of the Church, but were not binding on the conscience of any clergymen, ‘notwithstanding subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles,’ except so far as he is ‘persuaded,’ in his own private judgment, that their statements ‘may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures’ :—

I never troubled myself with answering any arguments, which the opponents in the Divinity-Schools brought against the Articles of the Church, nor ever admitted their authority as decisive of a difficulty. But I used on such occasions to say to them, holding the New Testament in my hand, ‘*En sacrum codicem!* Behold the sacred text! Here is the fountain of truth. Why do you follow the streams derived from it by the sophistry, or polluted by the passions, of man? . . . Articles of Churches are not of divine authority. Have done with them,—for they may be true, they may be false,—and appeal to the Book itself.’—i.p.63.

I certainly dislike the *imposition* of all Creeds formed by human authority; though I do not dislike them as useful summaries of what *their compilers believe* to be true, either in natural or revealed religion. . . . As to revealed religion, though all its doctrines are expressed in one book, yet such a diversity of interpretations has been given to the same passages of Scripture, that not only individuals, but whole Churches, have formed to themselves different Creeds, and introduced them into their forms of worship. The Greek Church admits not into its ritual either the Apostles’ Creed or the Athanasian, but only the Nicene. The Episcopal Church in America admits the Nicene and the Apostles’ Creed, but rejects the Athanasian. The Church of England admits the whole three into its Liturgy; and some of the foreign Protestant Churches admit none but the Apostles’. These and other Creeds, which might be mentioned, are all of human fabrication. They oblige conscience as far as they are conformable to Scripture, and of that conformity every man must judge for himself. This liberty of private judgment is recognised by our Church (*notwithstanding the Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles*), when in the service of the Ordering of Priests, it proposes this question, ‘Are you determined, out of the said Scriptures, to instruct the people committed to your charge, and to teach nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which YOU SHALL BE PERSUADED may be concluded and proved by the Scriptures?’—i.p.395-97.

What are the catechisms of the Romish Church, of the English Church, of the Scotch Church, and of all other Churches, but a set of propositions, which men of different natural capacities, educations, prejudices, have fabricated, (sometimes on the anvil of sincerity, oftener on that of ignorance, interest, or hypocrisy,) from the Divine materials furnished by the Bible? And can any man of an enlarged charity believe that his salvation will ultimately depend on a concurrence in opinion with *any* of these niceties, which the several sects of Christians have assumed, as essentially necessary for a Christian man’s belief? Oh! no: Christianity is not a speculative business. One good act, performed from a principle of obedience to the declared Will of God, will be of more service to every individual Christian than all the speculative theology of AUGUSTINE.—ii.p.215.

Nay, he goes even so far as to say, ii.p.217,—

I am disposed to accede to your remark that whatever doctrine is not contained in the form prescribed by Christ, for receiving disciples by baptism into His Church, cannot be necessary to be believed by Christians. And you have excited a reasonable doubt, whether the doctrine of the Trinity be positively contained in the baptismal form.

The following passage also, from one of Bishop WATSON’S Charges (*Apologies*, &c. p.449), is worthy to be commended, at least for the sake of the facts which it mentions, to the notice of some modern defenders of the traditionary theology :—

The time, I think, is approaching,—or is already come,—when Christianity will undergo a more severe investigation than it has ever yet done. My expectation as to the issue is this,—that Catholic countries will become Protestant, and *that Protestant countries will admit a further Reformation*. In expressing this expectation, which I am far from having the vanity to propose with oracular confidence, I may possibly incur the censure of some, who think that Protestantism, as established in Germany, in Scotland, in England, is in all these, and in other countries, so perfect a system of Christianity, that it is incapable of any amendment in any of them. If this should be the case, I must console myself by reflecting that the greatest men could not, in their day, escape unmerited calumny. Every age has had its Sacheverels, its Hickeses, and its Chenellses, who, with the bitterness of theological odium, sharpened with party rancour, have not scrupled to break the bonds of Christian charity. HOADLEY was called a Dissenter, CHILLINGWORTH a Socinian, and TILLOTSON both Socinian and Atheist. And all of them experienced this obloquy from contemporary zealots, on account of the liberality of their sentiments,—on account of their endeavouring to render Christianity more rational, than it was in certain points generally esteemed to be.

Meanwhile, as far as my own justification is concerned, it will, I believe, in the opinion of many, be considered to be complete, when they peruse the following recently-expressed judgments of others, in reference to the main facts of these criticisms.

I shall first quote extracts from communications which I have received from Prof. KUENEN of Leyden, one of the most eminent critics of the present day in Holland, and especially distinguished in this department of Biblical Criticism. Prof. KUENEN writes, with reference to Part I and Part II of my work :

‘I see, in your critical labours, more than a mere important episode of the Church-conflict of our days. It appears to me that through you already, in Part I, the attention has been fixed upon a series of facts, which, in the latest time, have been too much neglected, with great damage to the truth. You have entered upon the enquiry, as to the value and origin of the narratives about the Mosaic time, from a side to which by many scarcely any attention has been paid. This I say in the first instance with reference to myself. While writing my Introduction to the Pentateuch and to the Book of Joshua, I was, it is true, aware of the unhistorical character of many narratives; but I had not hitherto given to myself proper account of the extent of these difficulties. They could only be fully and plainly brought into the light through the method followed by you; and they now lie bare before everyone who is willing to see. When I take into consideration in how unsatisfactory a way even some of the very best writers indicate and clear out of the way these difficulties, I consider your endeavour to treat them entirely apart, and exhibit them visibly, as equally opportune and useful. As far as I am concerned, should the opportunity arise for me to treat again expressly of the Pentateuch, either in my lectures, or in writing, I shall not neglect thereby to make use of the light kindled by you.

‘When engaged upon the Third Part of my “Hist. Crit. Enquiry,” in which I shall have to speak about the Psalms, I shall have an opportunity of studying expressly the Elohist and Jehovistic Psalms, with an eye to your enquiry about them in Part II. I wish to do so with all the calmness and impartiality, with which so thorough a demonstration as yours deserves to be treated.

‘But I may not detain you longer with my remarks. Regard them only as a proof that I have read your important work with care, and that I hope still further to do so, when the course of my studies shall give me occasion for it. The question as to the composition of the Pentateuch and the age of its portions is so intricate, that it may well be that at first no unanimous agreement will be arrived at respecting it. But the difference of feeling that remains is small in comparison with the great main-point, and with the important consequences which follow from it. It is to me a cause of great joy that the main-point also, through your work, is put anew clearly into the light, and will certainly be recognised in a continually widening circle.’—*June 23, 1863.*

‘I gladly give you the desired permission to insert in your Preface the portion of my former letter translated by you. It not only expressed then, but it expresses also now, so entirely my feeling, that I allow it to be published without any hesitation.’—*Nov. 23, 1863.*

The next quotation is from the pen of Prof. HUPFELD of Halle, who ranks as a veteran among the first of Hebrew scholars in

Germany, and who was chosen, indeed, to fill the chair which was vacated by the death of GENSENIUS. Prof. HUPFELD writes thus, with reference to Part III:

'It would be far too late to acknowledge the receipt of the Third Part of your work. But it is not too late, I hope, to express the great satisfaction which this part has given me. I would have done so earlier, but I was interrupted by other duties in the perusal of the volume, before having finished which I disliked to utter a judgment.

'At the first view, I was favourably impressed by the long series and accurate enumeration of words and phrases peculiar to Deuteronomy, in comparison with the former books of the Pentateuch, and common with the later historical and prophetic books of the Old Testament, by which the demonstration of the later origin of Deuteronomy is supported. This matter-of-fact evidence is begun by DE WETTE in the first product of his pen (1805), and augmented by KNOBEL; but yours is far the most complete and accurate or discriminating. . . . At the same time, this manner of demonstration from the language would be the fittest means of shaming your opponents, who, conscious of their own Hebrew *ignorance*, are so loud and busy in decrying your Hebrew scholarship. There are some, not important, particulars in which I am not of the same mind with you, . . . and, in my opinion, you are too positive and eager in pointing out Jeremiah as the author of this Book (Deuteronomy), which is only *certain* to be of *his time*, phrases and notions being common to that period. But, upon the whole, I am satisfied with the proofs of your sound critical feeling in this volume.

'The Preface to the volume contains very curious evidences of the dishonesty of your judges, in striking contrast with the honesty of one clergyman, who was at first among your opponents. These documents, like those in the former volumes, will not be lost upon the great body of thinking and impartial bystanders, which will be increasing the more as the opposite cause is so miserably pleaded. They are not wanting in zeal and industry; in one number of the "Athenæum," I read the titles of more than twenty pamphlets against you. But, if I may infer from the specimens which I have seen. (M'CARTL, ROGERS, the Author of the "Eclipse of Faith," and BIRKS "Exodus of Israel," sent to me a few days ago,) they will not make any impression on the public mind. It was some consolation that at least two of your eminent Bishops, TAIT and THIRLWALL, had the courage and regard for their character to withhold from partaking in these measures.'—July 30, 1863.

For many the names of HUPFELD and KUENEN will have their due weight. But the next witness comes recommended as an English clergyman, filling more than one office of distinction,—the Rev. J. J. S. PEROWNE, B.D., Vice-Principal of St. David's College, Lampeter, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Norwich, and late Hebrew Lecturer of King's College, London, and Assistant Preacher of Lincoln's Inn.

The story of the article upon the Flood in Dr. SMITH'S 'Dictionary of the Bible' is well-known,—how when you turn to 'DELUGE,' you find '[FLOOD],' and, when you turn to 'FLOOD,' you are referred on to '[NOAH].' The delay is generally understood to have arisen from the conservative tendencies of the editor or publisher, and the difficulty of encountering the subject, in such a way as not to shock too strongly the popular religious notions of the day. However, the second and third volumes of this valuable work have now appeared; and Mr. PEROWNE, it seems, has contributed the articles on 'NOAH' and 'PENTATEUCH.' To what extent the writer's own opinions are in accordance with the traditionary view, may be judged from the following extracts, which I make from the first of these articles; though Mr. PEROWNE, it will be seen, has been obliged, in common with many

others, to abandon the notion of an *Universal Deluge*, which alone the Bible plainly speaks of:—

It should be remembered that this huge structure was only intended to float on the water, and was not, in the proper sense of the word, a ship. It had neither mast, sail, nor rudder; it was, in fact, nothing but an enormous floating house or oblong box. . . . Two objects only were aimed at in its construction: the one was that it should have ample stowage, and the other, that it should be able to keep steady upon the water.—SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, ii.p.566.

It is not only the inadequate size of the ark to contain all, or anything like all the progenitors of our existing species of animals, which is conclusive against an universal Deluge. . . . It is true that Noah is told to take two 'of every living thing of all flesh': but that could only mean two of every animal *then known* to him, unless we suppose him to have had supernatural information in zoology imparted,—a thing quite incredible. . . . Again, how were the carnivorous animals supplied with food during their twelve months' abode in the ark? This would have been difficult even for the very limited number of wild animals in Noah's immediate neighbourhood. For the very large numbers, which the theory of a universal Deluge supposes, it would have been quite impossible, unless again we have recourse to miracle, and either maintain that they were miraculously supplied with food, or that, for the time being, the nature of their teeth and stomach was changed, so that they were able to live on vegetables. But these hypotheses are so extravagant, and so utterly unsupported by the narrative itself, that they may be safely dismissed without further comment. . . . Indeed, it is out of the question to imagine that the ark rested on the top of a mountain (Ararat), which is covered for 4,000 feet from the summit with perpetual snow, and the descent from which would have been a very serious matter both to men and other animals.—ii.p.567-569.

Yet the statement in Gen.vii.5, that the tops of the mountains were not seen until seventy-three days after the Ark 'rested,' proves that, if it rested on Ararat at all, it must have been upon the summit. I have shown, however, in Chap. XIX of this Part, that a *partial* Deluge, of the kind here described, is quite as impossible as a general one. There is no use, therefore, in twisting the plain meaning of the Scripture, to make it say what to the 'wayfaring man' it certainly does not say. But I doubt if any article could be written upon the Deluge *in this day*,—by anyone who desired to maintain some character as a man of science or, indeed, of common sense,—*more* conservative than that which Mr. PEROWNE has written. He is therefore, I presume, a most unexceptionable witness.

Let us now, then, see what Mr. PEROWNE has to say about the Pentateuch. I must commend him for the candour and courage which he has shown, in speaking out plainly the truth as he sees it. But let my readers—my lay-readers especially—consider the force of the following admissions, coming from a writer who is still trammelled, it is plain,—as we see by his remarks on the Deluge,—by the influence of his educational training and prepossessions:—

If, without any theory casting its shadow upon us, and without any fear of consequences before our eyes, we read thoughtfully only the Book of Genesis, we can hardly escape the conviction, that it partakes of the nature of a compilation. . . .

At the very opening of the book, peculiarities of style and manner are discernible, which can scarcely escape the notice of a careful reader even of a translation,—which certainly are no sooner pointed out, than we are compelled to admit their existence. The language of chap. i.1-ii.3 is totally unlike that of the section which follows, ii.4-iii.23. This last is not only distinguished by a peculiar use of the Divine Names, but also by a mode of expression peculiar to itself. It is also remarkable for preserving an account of the Creation, distinct from that contained in the first chapter. It may be said, indeed, that this account does not contradict the

former (?), and might, therefore, have proceeded from the same pen. But, fully admitting that there is no contradiction, the representation is so different that it is far more natural to conclude that it was derived from some other, though not antagonistic, source. . . . Still, in any case, it cannot be denied that this second account has the character of a *supplement*,—that it is designed, if not to correct, at least to explain the other. And this fact, taken in connection with the peculiarities of the phraseology, and the use of the Divine Names in the same section, is quite sufficient to justify the supposition, that we have here an instance, not of independent narrative, but of *compilation from different sources*. . . .

Still this phenomenon of the distinct use of the Divine Names would scarcely of itself prove the point, that there are two documents which form the groundwork of the existing Pentateuch. But there is other evidence pointing the same way :—

(i) We find, for instance, the same story told by the two writers, and their two accounts manifestly interwoven; and we find also certain favourite words and phrases, which distinguish the one writer from the other. . . .

(ii) But, again, we find that these duplicate narratives are characterised by peculiar modes of expression, and that, generally, the Elohist and Jehovistic sections have their own distinct and individual colouring.

So far, then, judging this work simply by what we find in it, there is abundant evidence to show that, though the main bulk (?) of it is *Mosaic*, certain detached portions of it are of later growth.—ii. p. 774-8.

The above extracts are enough for my purpose, and they are written by the 'Examining Chaplain of the Bishop of NORWICH.' Mr. PEROWNE differs from me decidedly in some important points of criticism. In particular, he maintains that Moses wrote the whole Book of Deuteronomy, whereas I believe that a later Prophet wrote it about the time of Josiah; and I have given, as I conceive, a demonstration of that fact in Part III.

But this is only a difference in detail. The passages, above quoted from Mr. PEROWNE's paper, are abundantly sufficient to confirm me in the opinion that the '*great main point*,' for which I am contending, is undeniably true, and that the traditionary opinion concerning the authorship of the Pentateuch must henceforth be abandoned. It is plain that the Pentateuch is not by any means the work of one single hand, the hand of Moses, but a composite work, the work of different hands in different ages. And therefore, though critics may ascribe to Moses himself, some more, some less, and some none at all, of the *written* story, as it now lies before us, yet this is merely a question of detail, which can only be settled with more or less certainty by such processes of careful, laborious, and conscientious criticism, as those which I have endeavoured, to the best of my power, to carry out in my different volumes. And who so fitting, as the Clergy of the Church of England, to conduct and complete such criticism?

For our ordination-vows, as Ministers of a Protestant Church, not only do not forbid, but positively bind us in the most solemn way, in the face of the Congregation, to make such enquiries, and to declare the results of them, if we think it needful or desirable to do so. Every presbyter of the National Church is solemnly pledged at his ordination to 'be diligent in reading of the holy Scriptures, and of such *studies* as help to the knowledge of the same,'—of such critical studies, therefore, as contribute to the more

thorough understanding of the Pentateuch, as well as the New Testament. Further, he is then solemnly pledged to teach nothing as necessary to salvation, but what he '*shall be persuaded* may be concluded and proved by the same.' He is *not*, therefore, to teach that 'all our hopes for eternity depend' upon belief in the historical truth of Noah's Flood or the story of the Exodus, or on the trustworthiness of every line in the Bible, if in his own mind and conscience he is not persuaded that the Scriptures, when carefully examined, suffice to 'conclude and prove' the truth of such statements. And every Bishop is then pledged to banish and drive away, '*privately and openly*,' all erroneous doctrine, contrary to God's Word,—such as that which lays down the traditionary view of Scripture, stated above. Such vows are taken by a Bishop at his Consecration, in the presence of the people, '*to the end*,' it is said—

that the Congregation present may have a trial, and bear witness, how you be minded to behave yourself in the Church of God.

The Church, moreover, in the Ordination Service, does solemnly require a Bishop also to declare, that he will 'exercise himself faithfully in the holy Scriptures, and to call upon God by prayer, for the *true understanding of the same*,' and that he will 'teach or maintain nothing, as required of necessity to eternal salvation, but that which *he shall be persuaded* may be concluded and proved by the same.' In this vow is expressed the spirit of our Protestant Church, the very principle of the *Reformation*, which, in the words of Dean HOOK (*Manchester Church Congress*, 1863),—words that cannot be repeated too often,—is—

the necessity of asserting the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—

in opposition to the principle of *Mediævalism*, which, he says, is,—when the assertion of the truth is likely to promote discord, to postpone the true to the expedient.

As Bishop WATSON has justly argued, these promises, so solemnly made, must overrule all others.

But 'we are perplexed by our *Subscriptions*, which the Law of the Land, at present, requires to be made by everyone admitted to Holy Orders.' Undoubtedly we are; and, if subscription* is to be regarded as expressing an unqualified assent to everything subscribed, then, as Dean STANLEY has very truly said,—

* At present, the Law requires that every layman admitted to a vote in the Senate of either of our great Universities, shall sign the Thirty-nine Articles. Here is an 'engagement,' on the strength of which the Master of Arts has received his power to vote upon important questions, affecting vitally, it may be, the future welfare of the Universities, and their relations to the National Church. Yet who will assert that every such layman is bound by this 'engagement' to believe in all the points of the Thirty-nine Articles unto his life's end, or to give up his vote, and take no further part in the management of the Universities, if he comes at any time to entertain a doubt upon any one of them?

There is not one clergyman in the Church of England, who can venture to cast a stone at another: they must all go out, from the greatest to the least, from the Archbishop in his palace at Lambeth to the humblest curate in the wilds of Cumberland.

It is a state of things much to be regretted; for it cannot be said that such compromises, as are now almost universally practised on some point or other, are at all conducive to a healthy, vigorous, religious life, either among the teachers or the taught. Even His Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury declared in the House of Lords that he could not, and would not, *himself* in certain cases fulfil the 'engagement,' to which he bound himself, when admitted to the sacred office. And now the Bishop of Oxford has said that he will protect his clergy in so doing, if consulted beforehand, and if the case is one which he approves.

Happily, our Church, as a National Institution, is not the creation of the Bishops and Clergy, but of the will of the Nation, expressed in Parliament. And, as Parliament has reformed it already more than once, it may do so again, and remove some, at least, of those hindrances, which now prevent it from discharging properly its office, as the great religious educator of the people. The very law which, as Bishop WILBERFORCE thinks, relieves him from the necessity of enforcing the Canons, is a law of the State, with reference to which no consent of the 'Church' was previously asked,—no approval even of 'Convocation' needed. A similar law may before long be passed to relieve the difficulties, which press more heavily on other minds. And the time seems fast ripening for this—when the voice of religious and earnest laymen shall be heard throughout the land, calling loudly on Parliament to interfere for such a Reform.

For the truth is, and we must rejoice to know it, that there has been a remarkable awakening of the religious life in this our day, altogether without the pale of Church dogmas. The great body of educated men do recognise the existence of 'Providence, Revelation, and Grace,'—though they do not adopt certain narrow definitions of these words. They 'believe in the Bible,' though they do not believe in the historical or scientific truth of all its statements; they believe that God reveals Himself to the spirit of man, though they do not suppose that His Revelation of Himself is confined to one nation or to one set of books. There is, in our days, a general acceptance of the Highest and Deepest Truths, as revelations in themselves, the communications of the Divine Being to His children, without a slavish adherence to the forms in which they have appeared, or to the authoritative ecclesiastical system of doctrine, to which some would limit their existence for us. And this very fact is the most impressive protest against the threat, which is held out, that, if men will not shut their eyes, and receive without questioning every 'jot and tittle' which the Church

administers, or each book of the Bible contains, they will be left before long without religion—without life, without hope, and without God in the world.

Great efforts are now being made to advance the education of the middle, as well as the lower, classes of this country. Yet, unless the way is first cleared, through such labours as those in which I am now engaged, by removing the contradictions which at present exist between the popular notions of Religion and the results of Science, it is obviously impossible that the education of the people should be carried on to any great extent in England. For, while religious teaching is connected inseparably with the traditionary belief in the historical truth of all parts of the Bible,—a belief which the advance of knowledge in our days shows to be utterly untenable,—it is certain that no considerable scientific progress *can* be made in our schools. The schoolmaster will not dare to introduce questions of Science, going at all beyond the usual routine, by which the accounts of the Creation and the Deluge are supposed to be ‘reconciled’ with well-known facts. Nay, he himself has very probably been reared in some Training Institution, from which all free scientific teaching must be banished, lest ‘one single line’ of Scripture should be shown to be ‘untrustworthy,’ in a scientific or historical point of view, and so ‘all our hopes for eternity,’—‘all our nearest and dearest consolations,’—should be suddenly, at one stroke, undermined.

I believe, then, that in endeavouring to do faithfully, to the best of my power, such a work as this,—in which I maintain that Religious and Scientific Truth are one, and that, what God hath joined, no man, and no body of men, has a right to put asunder,—I am but discharging, however imperfectly, my duty as a Minister of the National Church, and promoting the cause of National education and improvement at home, as well as of those Missionary labours abroad, to which, in God’s Providence, my own life must be more especially devoted. If it would be wrong for a Christian Missionary of our day, to enforce the dogmas of the Church in former ages, which we now know to be absurd, and to mislead a class of native catechists, by teaching them that the Earth is flat, and the sky a solid firmament, above which the stores of rain are treasured,—when God has taught us otherwise,—it must be equally wrong and sinful, to teach them that the Scripture stories of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, are infallible records of historical fact, *if* God, by the discoveries of Science in our day, has taught us to know that these narratives—whatever they may be—are certainly not to be regarded as *history*.

But, using now the word ‘Church’ in its true, ancient, and venerable sense, as a general expression for the great Catholic Body,

which embraces all faithful souls throughout the world,—all those who have been ‘called out’ to receive more of Divine illumination than others,—all those who have been quickened with the word of Truth, and have heard and obeyed it, as far as they heard it,—all those on whose eyes the Light of God has shone, ‘the Light which lighteneth every man that comes into the world,’ and who have striven by God’s grace to walk in it,—in one word, as embracing all true men and women, servants of God, sons and daughters of the Lord Almighty,—by whatever name they are known to men, by whatever forms they may worship, whatever measure of the knowledge of Himself, and of His highest Revelations of Himself, He may have been pleased to impart to them,—I am fully satisfied that the cause of Truth *must* now advance in the Church in England,—perhaps, as fast as is desirable, seeing that many strong prejudices and prepossessions have still to be removed, the rooting-up of which, however necessary to ensure the free growth of True Religion, and the full development of the Christian Life, must be a somewhat slow and painful work.

The difficulty is, indeed, increased by the conduct of those who, without stating what *is* to be believed, about the stories of the Creation and the Deluge, or the numbers of the Exodus,—without stating distinctly *what* our own Church says is to be believed on these points, and *where* she has said it,—without stating *what they themselves believe*,—are frightening their flocks from looking calmly, in the fear and faith of God, at the plain naked Truth,—delivering solemn warnings against some dark tremendous evil, which, they say, is approaching daily nearer, and cannot be kept off, and even now overshadows us,—telling us that, in all the literature of the day, in the works of poets, historians, reviewers, journalists, there is a lurking infidelity, and that in all the noble utterances of science, and clear conclusions of Biblical criticism, we may only be ‘hearing the echoes of the coming footfall of the great Antichrist.’ Thus it is that the hearts of men and women, unlearned, may be troubled for a time, and their minds held in painful suspense, possessed with a feeling of dread and uncertainty.

How different would it be, if all the more enlightened of the clergy were to take at once the stand, which in the end must assuredly be taken,—were to take boldly God’s facts, as they are, and bring them forth, in their habitual teaching, so making them by degrees familiar to the people! When such teaching as this is confirmed by the speaking earnestness of a pure and holy life, and enforced by a course of loving and devoted labour for the good of men, there need be no fear of men making shipwreck of their trust in God, or finding suddenly all their hopes for eternity failing, all ‘their nearest and dearest consolations’ taken from

them. Without any dangerous shock to their faith, a superstitious reverence for the letter of the Bible would then give way to a right and intelligent appreciation of the true value of the Scriptures, as containing God's Word, a blessed and glorious Revelation of His Eternal Truth to Man.

J. W. NATAL.

23, SUSSEX PLACE, KENSINGTON, W.

. Since the above was written, the recent Charge of the Bishop of St. DAVID'S has been published. I commend the following extracts from it to the reader's careful consideration, not on account of the bearing which they have on that part of the controversy which is personal to myself, but for the sake of the judicial clearness, with which Bishop THIRLWALL has described the proper limits of the action of Convocation in respect of books, and for the sake also of his distinct recognition of the ample latitude allowed to the clergy, by the law of our Church, in their enquiries into the genuineness and authenticity of the Biblical writings:—

'The Church has not attempted to fence the study of the Scripture, either for Clergy or Laity, with any restrictions as to the subject of enquiry, but has rather taught them to consider every kind of information, which throws light on any part of the Sacred Volume, as precious, either for present or possible use. . . . If the enquiry is to be free, it is impossible consistently to prescribe its results.'—p. 91.

'The Resolution [of Convocation], by which the Bishop of NATAL's book was condemned, assumes a paternal authority, which rather suits an earlier period in the education of the world; and it presupposes a childlike docility and obedience, in those over whom it is exercised, which are now very rarely to be found. It also suggests the question, what practical purpose it was designed to answer. Two were indicated in the Committee's Report,—“the effectual vindication of the truth of God's Word before men,” and “the warning and comfort of Christ's People.” But it is not clear how either of these objects could be attained by a declaration, that “the book involves errors of the gravest and most dangerous character.” Both seem to require that the censure should have pointed out the errors involved, or have stated the doctrine which the book had at least indirectly impugned, so as to make it clear that the alleged errors affected, not merely prevalent opinions, but truths universally recognised as part of the Church's creed.'—p. 101.

'According to the view which I have ventured to take of the proper limits of synodical action in the cognisance of books, the Committee overstept those limits. They were appointed to examine the Parts which had then appeared of the Bishop's work, and to report “whether any—and if any, what—opinions, heretical or erroneous in doctrine, were contained in it.” They extracted three propositions, which they have characterised as we have seen. . . .

*'It may seem, indeed, as if the Committee, in their mode of dealing with the first of the propositions, which they cite or extract for censure, had shown that they were aware of the precise nature of the function they had to perform, and meant to confine themselves to it. That proposition is,—“The Bible is not itself God's Word.” The author himself immediately adds, “But assuredly ‘God's Word’ will be heard in the Bible, by all who will humbly and devoutly listen for it.” Of this qualification, the Committee, in their remarks on the proposition, take no notice whatever. But they first observe that the proposition, as they cite it, “is contrary to the faith of the Universal Church, which has always taught that Holy Scripture is given by inspiration of the Holy Ghost.” They seem to have overlooked that this statement, however true, was irrelevant; but they then proceed to refer to the Articles and Formularies of our own Church, which are, indeed, the only authority binding on her ministers. But, unfortunately, not one of the passages, to which they refer, applies to the proposition condemned. Many, indeed, among them do clearly describe the Bible as the “Word of God.” But not one affirms that “the Bible is itself God's Word.” . . . No doubt, the expression indicated that the author made a distinction between the Bible and the Word of God, and considered the two terms as not precisely equivalent or absolutely interchangeable. . . . And there is certainly high authority for the distinction. Among the numerous passages of the New Testament, in which the phrase, *the Word of God*, occurs, there is not one in which it signifies the Bible, or in which that word could be substituted for it without manifest absurdity. But, even in our Articles and Formularies, there are several, in which the two terms do not appear to be treated as synonymous. . . . *If the Word of God is to be found nowhere but in Holy Writ, not only would no other Christian Literature be properly called sacred, but the Bible itself would be degraded to a dead and barren letter, and would not be a living spring of Divine Truth.* On the whole, the Report first attaches an arbitrary meaning to an ambiguous expression, and then charges it with contradicting authorities, which are either wholly silent upon it, or seem to countenance and warrant it. . . .*

'But, in their treatment of the next proposition, the Committee seem almost entirely to have lost sight of the principle, which, although misapplied, appeared to guide them in their examination of the first. For, with a single insignificant exception, they confront it, not with our Articles and Formularies, but with *passages of Scripture*. Quotations from Scripture may add great weight to a theological argument; they are essential for the establishment of any doctrine of a Church, which professes to ground its teaching on Scripture; but they are entirely out of place where the question is, not whether a doctrine is true or false, but whether it is the doctrine of the Church of England. . . . This is no legal refinement, but a plain dictate of common sense; and it does not at all depend on the composition of the tribunal before which such questions are tried, so as to be less applicable if the Court consisted entirely of ecclesiastics. . . . I should think it a great misfortune to the Church, if Convocation, sitting in judgment on the orthodoxy of a theological work, though without any view to proceedings against the author, should ignore and practically reject that principle. And, if in this respect the Report betrays the influence of a personal prepossession, which, however natural, ought not to be allowed to sway the decisions of a grave assembly,—above all, so as to bring them into conflict with the highest legal authorities of the Realm,—we have the more reason to rejoice that it did not obtain the sanction of the Upper House.

'When I look at the Scriptural arguments adduced in the Report against the second proposition extracted for condemnation, they do not seem to me of such a quality as to deserve to form an exception, if any could be admitted, to the rule which would exclude them from such an investigation. . . . The Committee observe that "Moses is spoken of, by our Blessed Lord in the Gospel, as the writer of the Pentateuch." I suspect that even a layman, little acquainted with the manifold aspects of the question, and the almost infinite number of surmises which have been or may be formed concerning it, would be somewhat disappointed, when he found that the proof of this statement consists of three passages, in which our Lord speaks of "Moses and the Prophets," of the "law of Moses," and of "writings of Moses." It is true that it would not be a fatal objection to the argument, that the word "Pentateuch" does not occur in the Bible. It might have been so described, as to connect every part of its contents with the hand of Moses, as distinctly as if the observation of the Committee had been literally true. But in fact this is not the case; and still less is any such distinct appropriation to be found in any of the passages cited by the Committee in support of their assertion, that "Moses is recognised as the writer of the Pentateuch in other passages of Holy Scripture." They are neither more nor less conclusive than the language of the Seventh Article, to which the Committee confine all the reference they have made to the judgment of the Church on this question,—though this was the only matter into which it was their proper business to enquire. The Article alludes to "the law given from God by Moses,"—a slender foundation for any inference as to the record of that law, much more as to the authorship of other parts of the Pentateuch, especially as the name of Moses does not occur in the enumeration of the canonical books in the Sixth Article. If the question had been as to the authorship of the Book of *Psalms*, few persons probably would think that it had been dogmatically decided by the Church, because in the Prayer-Book the Psalter is described as the "Psalms of David."

'The third proposition, "variously stated in the book," relates to the historical truth of the Pentateuch, which the author denies, not in the sense that everything in it is pure fiction, but that all is not historically true. . . . But it is to be regretted that the Committee should again have lost sight of the object for which they were appointed, and have omitted to refer to any doctrine of the Church, which the author has contradicted. This was the more incumbent on them, since a recent judgment has formally sanctioned a very wide latitude in this respect. It is clear that, in such things, there cannot be two weights and two measures for different persons, and also that it does not belong to any but legal authority to draw the line, by which the freedom, *absolutely granted in theory*, is to be limited in practice. . . .

'These are the propositions which they extract as the "main propositions of the book," which, though not pretending to "pronounce definitively whether they are or are not heretical," they denounce as "involving errors of the gravest and most dangerous character." But they proceed to cite a further proposition, which the author states in the form of a question, to meet an objection which had been raised against his main conclusion, as virtually rejecting Our Lord's authority, by which, as the Committee state, "the genuineness and the authenticity of the Pentateuch have been guaranteed to all men." Whether the passages, in which Our Lord quotes or alludes to the Pentateuch, amount to such a guarantee, is a point which they do not discuss. They only observe that the proposition "questions our Blessed Lord's Divine knowledge,"—and with that remark they drop the subject.

'Considering that this proposition is incomparably the most important of all that they cite, . . . one is surprised that it should have been dismissed with so very cursory and imperfect a notice. For it is not even clear that it correctly expresses the author's meaning. The question which he raises does not properly concern Our Lord's Divine knowledge, that is, the knowledge belonging to His Divine Nature. It

is whether His human knowledge was coextensive with the Divine Omniscience. It is obvious, at the first glance, what a vast field of speculation, theological and metaphysical, is opened by this suggestion. . . . Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR observes: "They, that love to serve God in hard questions, use to dispute whether Christ did truly, or in appearance only, increase in wisdom. . . . Others . . . apprehend no inconvenience in affirming it to belong to the verity of human nature, to have degrees of understanding as well as of other perfections; and although the humanity of Christ made up the same person with His Divinity, yet they think the Divinity still to be free, even in those communications which were imparted to His inferior nature. . . ." It is clear to which side TAYLOR inclines. But I must own I should be sorry to see these hard questions revived. . . . Still more should I deprecate any attempt of the Church of England to promulge a new dogma for the settlement of this controversy. And I lament that the Committee of the Lower House should have expressed themselves, as if either there was no "dispute" on the subject, or it belonged to them to end it by a word. But, at least, as their remark indicated that the Bishop had, in their judgment, fallen into some grave error, it was due, not only to him, but the readers of their Report, and to the Church at large, that they should have pointed out what the error was, by a comparison with the doctrine of the Church which it was supposed to contradict.—p.103-115.

I add also the following from a Lecture on 'Science and Theology,' lately delivered by Chief-Justice HANSON, of South Australia.

'The uniform course of opinion during the last half century among all competent enquirers has been in a direction adverse to the historical character, at least of the early part, of the Book of Genesis. Geology has, I believe I may say, utterly exploded the notion of Creation in six days as given in the first chapter, as well as the idea of a universal Deluge; and it is gradually throwing back the date of the first appearance of man upon the globe to an antiquity which, according to present appearances, will ultimately be measured by hundreds of thousands of years. The Science of Language and Ethnology both tend to show that the separation of the human family, if, as is probable, it was one family originally, must be thrown back for tens of thousands of years, and that the people of Canaan, whom the Israelites drove out, belonged, no less than the Israelites themselves, to the Semitic race, instead of being Hamites, while the Persians belonged to the Indo-European family, instead of being, as the author of the tenth chapter of Genesis makes them, Semitic. And, at the same time, critical investigations, as to the age and authorship of the Book, are leading unmistakably to the belief that, whoever its compiler might be, and whatever ancient documents might be embodied in it, there were, at any rate, more than two persons concerned in its authorship, the earliest of whom could not have lived much before, and probably did not live after, the time of David. I do not now put forward these conclusions as true, though personally I consider the evidence such as to warrant our belief of their truth; but I mention them as those conclusions, to which the current of opinion is now leading, and which the majority of independent thinkers, who devote themselves to these enquiries, will be likely to adopt. *In fact, but for the theological interests supposed to be at stake, and the theological passions therefore aroused, I believe that there would at this time be no more doubt, as to the general truth of the conclusions which Bishop Colenso is enunciating, with regard to the uncertainty of the early history of the world and of the Jews, than there is with regard to those put forth by Niebuhr, as to the uncertainty of the early history of the Romans.* But, however this may be, it cannot be denied that among independent thinkers, who have directed their enquiries to this subject, the tendency is towards the conclusions which I have indicated, in spite of strong early prepossessions, and of no slight present inducements to maintain the contrary views. Now, is it to be supposed,—will anyone venture to assert,—that these views, if adopted, can affect the relation of man to God, or the purposes of God to man?—that the inducements to virtue or piety will be diminished, or that virtue and piety will be less acceptable to God?—or even that these opinions, if honestly formed and manfully proclaimed, will be less pleasing in the eyes of the God of Truth, than the contrary opinions, taken at second hand without enquiry, or obtained as the result of an enquiry whose conclusion was foredetermined? No doubt it is true that many opinions, which we have been accustomed to hold,—rather, though, upon the authority of the school-men and of Milton than of the Bible,—will fall if these views ultimately prevail; and those, who insist upon having their Theology in a systematic form, may have to remodel their systems. But these are the necessary consequences, in every branch of enquiry, of the discovery of new truths, whenever systems have been prematurely formed. Still, whatever may be their results, unless we are prepared to prohibit all scientific investigation, these enquiries are demanded by the very importance and sacredness of the subject; and, if instituted, they must be carried on with no other purpose than that of following Truth, whithersoever it may lead us.'

PART IV.

THE FIRST ELEVEN CHAPTERS OF GENESIS.

CHAPTER I.

THE COMPOSITE CHARACTER OF THE PENTATEUCH.

901. We shall now proceed to redeem to some extent the promise made in (205), so far, we trust, as to satisfy the thoughtful reader, by actual presentation of the fact before his own eyes that the Book of Genesis is, as we have said, a composite narrative, the product of different authors, to each of whom may be assigned his own particular part of the work. As HUFFELD justly observes,

We have here the most simple and most effective practical refutation of a host of 'Replies,' and of all the ingenuity expended upon them.

902. We shall at present confine the reader's attention to the first eleven chapters of Genesis. In these chapters, the parts belonging to the different authors can be very easily distinguished, and can, in most instances, be assigned with confidence to their respective writers. After the eleventh chapter, the question becomes more complicated, by the appearance of insertions by other hands. Still, throughout the whole Book of Genesis, the primitive Elohist narrative can be traced without much difficulty, and, as we hope to show in the sequel, can be almost reproduced in its original form.

903. A few words must here be said as to the method which will be pursued in the following analysis. We have already stated (206) that, throughout the Book of Genesis, two different hands at least are distinctly visible, one of

which is characterised by the *constant* use of the name Elohim, the other by the intermixture with it of the name Jehovah, on which account the writers are usually called the 'Elohist' and 'Jehovist,' respectively. And we have mentioned also (207) that there are certain peculiarities of expression, which mark the style of each of these writers. We must not, however, assume, for the purposes of the present analysis, that all this will be granted beforehand.

904. Rather, we must lay aside all previous notions as to the characteristics which distinguish the different writers, and endeavour to track the footsteps of each, from one passage to another, by means only of the internal evidence, which a close consideration of the text itself may furnish. In this department of Biblical literature, as in many other branches of Science, it is only this minute, laborious, *microscopic* examination,—however neglected and, perhaps despised by many, who are impatient of such slow processes, and delight to expatiate in 'larger and grander views' of the whole subject,—which can really be of service, in enabling us to lay a sound basis of fact, upon which to construct a reasonable and trustworthy theory, as to the age and authorship of the different parts of the Mosaic story.

905. While, therefore, we shall retain in the following analysis the words 'Elohist' and 'Jehovist,' as convenient designations for the two principal writers, whose hands can be plainly discerned in these chapters, yet the

reader will find that nothing has been taken for granted beforehand; but each passage, as it passes under review, is traced to its writer by means of distinct internal evidence, which shows that it belongs to that particular writer, and not to the other. It will be found that the sections, marked as 'Elohistic,' are all linked together, each being connected, by its modes of thought or forms of expression, with other Elohistic passages, and having no such relation to the Jehovistic sections,—while these latter not only exhibit among themselves a corresponding family resemblance, very distinct from that which marks the style of the Elohist, but also contain expressions, which appear to indicate that they were composed at a time, when the Elohistic narrative was already existing, and known to the Jehovistic writer.

906. In this analysis, intended for the use of the English reader not acquainted with Hebrew, we shall be obliged, of course, to omit a great number of the details, which form such a complete and convincing mass of evidence in the larger edition. Still we trust to be able to produce enough of these details to satisfy the mind of any candid and attentive student, as to the general truth of our conclusions. We shall adopt throughout our own translation of the original, as given below, which differs slightly in some places from the English version in consequence of being more literal and accurate.

CHAPTER II.

ANALYSIS OF GEN. I.1-IV.26.

907. i.1-ii.3 (E.35*) is manifestly *Elohistic*, the work of one hand throughout.

* E., J., J.E., are used, as before, to denote the words 'Elohim,' 'Jehovah,' 'Jehovah-Elohim'; and (E.35) implies that 'Elohim' occurs 35 times in the section, i.1-ii.3, and 'Jehovah' not at all. Also v.4^a, v.4^b, &c., are used to denote, respectively, the *first*, *second*, &c., clauses of v.4; *comp.*=compare, *contr.*=contrast.

The reader is recommended to mark each one of the Jehovistic passages, when he is satisfied about it, in an English Bible, by a line drawn down the margin. This will be found very convenient for reference.

It is very possible that ii.4*—

'These are the generations of the Heaven and the Earth in their creation'—

may also be Elohistic, for the following reasons:—

(i) It contains 'the Heaven and the Earth,' as in i.1,ii.1, the words being used *with* the articles; whereas in ii.4^b we find the words *without* the articles, and in *different order*, 'Earth and Heaven';

(ii) The expression 'in their creation,' corresponds to the Elohistic language in v.2, 'in the day of their creation';

(iii) These words suit best the *first* account of the Creation in which alone the actual creation of 'the Heaven,' i.8, and 'the Earth,' i.10, is described; whereas chap.ii mentions only the formation of *man*, ii.7, *plants*, ii.9, *animals*, ii.19, and *woman*, ii.22.

908. We shall retain i.4^a, however, as the first clause of the Jehovistic narrative, without deciding to whom it really belongs. In any case, the involved construction in v.4, when compared with the verses which precede and follow it, is a sign that it does not proceed in an independent, original form from the pen of either of the principal writers, but contains expressions of both fused together, to form the connecting link between two distinct narratives.

909. ii.4-25 (J.E.11) is *Jehovistic*, the writer using throughout—not Elohim, as the writer of i.1-ii.3, but—Jehovah-Elohim, and showing himself to be a *different* writer by the following variations, which exist between his account of the creation and that of the former writer:—

(i) v.6, 'a mist rose from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground': *contr.* i.9,10, where the earth is described as emerging from the waters, and as being, therefore, already saturated with moisture;

(ii) v.7, man is created *first* of all living creatures, *before* the birds and beasts, v.19: *contr.* i.26, where he is created *last* of all, *after* the birds and beasts, i.21,25;

(iii) v.7, man is 'formed of the dust of the ground': *contr.* i.27, where man is 'created in the image of God,' and, apparently, by a direct act of creative power;

(iv) v.7, the *man* is made by himself, *without* the *woman*, who is made *last*, v.22, by a kind of afterthought, v.18: *contr.* i.27, where man and woman are created together, *last* of all created things;

(v) v.15, the man, after being made, is

It will be remembered that in the Eng. Vers. 'Elohim' is represented by God, 'Jehovah' by LORD, and 'Adonai' by Lord.

placed alone in the garden, 'to till it and to keep it,' receiving also alone by himself the Divine command; and he continues in the garden some time by himself, long enough to 'call names to all the cattle, and to the fowl of the heaven, and to every animal of the field,' v.20: *contr.* i.28, where man and woman, on the sixth day, immediately after their creation, are blessed together, and are together endowed with dominion over the whole earth;

(vi) v.21,22, the woman is made out of one of the man's ribs; *contr.* i.27, where the woman, is described, apparently, as created, in the same kind of way as the man, by a direct act of creative power.

910. It is obvious that two accounts of the Creation, so different from each other in general character, and in some points varying so remarkably from each other, cannot have proceeded from one and the same hand. Accordingly, observing the peculiar use of the Divine Name in them, we are already justified in using the names 'Elohism' and 'Jehovism' to designate the two writers, whoever they may have been, in whatever age they may have lived, to whom these two sections, i.1-ii.3, ii.4-25, may be now with good reason assumed to be due. We shall find, as we proceed, that the remaining sections of these first eleven chapters separate themselves at once, when attention is paid to the internal evidence which they present; into two sets of passages, differing from each other in tone of thought and forms of expression, and, with one or two exceptions, distinctly referable to the same two writers, to whom must be assigned the composition of the above two primary sections.

911. We now add the following remarks upon the Jehovistic passage, ii.4-25.

(i) In v.20 we have the name 'Adam,' which the Jehovist may have adopted from the Elohist in i.26, — 'Let us make Adam (E.V. man)'; and he wishes, apparently, to connect it with *adamah*, 'ground,' in ii.7, — and Jehovah-Elohim formed the man (*ha-Adam*) of dust out of the ground (*ha-Adamah*).

(ii) v.23, the Jehovist notes the derivation of the name *ishah*, 'woman,' from *ish*, 'man.'

912. iii.1-24, *Jehovistic*.

This section is manifestly due to the writer of the preceding section, whoever he may be, since it not only contains the same peculiar form of the Divine Name, but is full of references

to the former section, as is shown below, while it betrays no such relation to the previous Elohist section, — a fact, which confirms decisively our previous conclusion as to the difference between the two authors.

(i) v.1,8,8,9,13,14,21,22,23, 'Jehovah-Elohim': the writer, however, abstains from placing it in the mouth of the *serpent*, v.1,5, and in that of the *woman*, v.3, who apparently repeats the words of the serpent;

(ii) v.1,2,3,8,10, 'the garden,' as in ii.8,9,10, 15,16;

(iii) v.1-3, 'is it so that Elohim has said,' &c.: *comp.* the command in ii.16,17;

(iv) v.1,14, 'animal of the field,' as in ii.19, 20: *contr.* 'animal of the earth,' i.25,30;

(v) v.3, 'the tree which is in the midst of the garden': *comp.* ii.9;

(vi) v.5, 'in the day of your eating of it': *comp.* ii.17, 'in the day of thy eating of it';

(vii) v.8, 'knowing good and evil,' v.22, 'for the knowledge of good and evil': *comp.* ii.9,17, 'the tree of the knowledge of good and evil';

(viii) v.7, 'they knew that they were naked,' v.10, 'I was afraid, because I was naked,' v.21, 'and clothed them': *comp.* ii.25, 'they were both naked';

(ix) v.18, 'herb of the field,' as in ii.5;

(x) v.20, the name *khavvah*, 'Eve,' derived from *khavah*, 'live': *comp.* the derivation of the names 'Adam,' ii.7, 'Ishah,' ii.23;

(xi) v.22, 'and Jehovah-Elohim said': *comp.* the secret speech which is ascribed to Jehovah-Elohim in ii.18; and observe that the somewhat similar E. passage, i.26, is essentially different in character, being merely an expansion of the creative words, 'And Elohim said,' in v.3,6, &c., and does not at all resemble the almost perplexed deliberation of the Divine Being with Himself, in ii.22;

(xii) v.22,24, 'tree of life,' as in ii.9;

(xiii) v.23, 'till the ground,' as in ii.5;

(xiv) v.23, 'the ground from which he was taken': *comp.* the account of Adam's formation in ii.7;

(xv) v.23,24, 'garden of Eden,' as in ii.15: *comp.* also 'Eden,' ii.8,10.

913. We may now assume that the writer of ii.4-iii.24 is one and the same person, and different from the Elohist author of i.1-ii.3. We may further observe that this Jehovistic writer is in the habit of using strong *anthropomorphisms*, ascribing to the Deity ordinary human actions. Thus we have Jehovah-Elohim spoken of as—

(i) forming the man of dust out of the ground, ii.7;

(ii) breathing into his nostrils, ii.7;

(iii) planting a garden, ii.8;

(iv) taking the man, and leaving him in the garden, ii.15;

(v) bringing the birds and beasts to Adam, ii.19;

(vi) desiring to see what he would call them, ii.19;

- (vii) taking out one of the man's ribs, ii. 21;
 (viii) closing up the flesh in its place, ii. 21;
 (ix) making the rib into a woman, ii. 22;
 (x) bringing the woman unto the man, ii. 22;
 (xi) walking in the breeze of the day, iii. 8;
 (xii) missing the man, and calling for him, iii. 9;
 (xiii) questioning him as to what he has done, iii. 11;
 (xiv) making coats of skins, iii. 21;
 (xv) clothing the man and woman, iii. 21;
 (xvi) grudging the man being like himself, iii. 22;
 (xvii) refusing to let him eat of the tree of life, iii. 22;
 (xviii) driving them out of the garden, iii. 24;
 (xix) taking precautions to prevent their return, iii. 24;
 (xx) reasoning within himself in human fashion, ii. 18, iii. 22.

914. As above observed (907.iii.), the Jehovist does not dwell at length upon the creation of the Heaven and the Earth, nor does he even mention at all the 'light,' 'firmament,' 'seas,' 'luminaries,' 'reptiles,' and 'fishes' of the Elohist document. He is evidently concerned mainly with *man* and his doings, and is intent on describing (i) his happy life in Paradise, blessed with the institution of marriage, in connection with which the beasts and birds are introduced, v. 19, formed out of the ground, and brought to Adam to be named; inasmuch as among these are found the domestic animals, which supply a certain kind of companionship, and prevent his feeling himself altogether 'alone,' which was 'not good' for him, v. 18,—and (ii) the terrible change, by which this happy state was lost.

915. This special object, which the writer had in view, may account for the somewhat abrupt manner in which he begins, ii. 4. TUCH observes, p. 40:—

Let us imagine the Jehovistic writer, with his purpose in his eye, set down before the preceding cosmogony. Why should he repeat circumstantially, what in that was freely described? Why should he relate again the separation of the Heaven from the Earth, the division of the waters, the creation of the heavenly bodies, [the production of the reptiles and fishes], which did not specially concern his particular purpose? With a few words, then, he puts all this together, 'in the day of Jehovah-Elohim's making Earth and Heaven,' so at once passing over to that which he purposes to describe.

916. iv. 1-26, *Jehovistic*.

This section, it will be seen, belongs to the same writer as the two preceding sections,—though he uses now 'Jehovah' only, instead of the compound name 'Jehovah-Elohim.' This appears from the numerous references made in it throughout to ii. 4-iii. 24, whereas there is no indication of any relationship to the E. section, i. 1-ii. 3.

(i) v. 1, 'Eve,' as in iii. 20: the Elohist does not mention at all the name of the first woman, nor does it occur anywhere else in the O.T.;

(ii) v. 2, the name *Kayin*, 'Cain,' derived from *kanah*, 'get': comp. the derivations of 'Adam,' ii. 7, 'Ishah,' ii. 23, 'Eve,' iii. 20;

(iii) v. 2, 12, 'till the ground,' as in ii. 5, iii. 23;

(iv) v. 7, 'and towards thee its desire, and thou—thou shalt rule over it': comp. iii. 16, 'and towards thy husband thy desire, and he—he shall rule over thee';

(v) v. 9, 'where is Abel thy brother?' comp. iii. 9, 'where art thou?'

(vi) v. 10, 'and He said, What hast thou done?' comp. iii. 13, 'and He said, What is this thou hast done?'

(vii) v. 11, 'cursed art thou,' &c.: comp. the curses in iii. 14, 17;

(viii) v. 12, 'when thou tillest the ground, it shall not henceforth yield unto thee its strength': comp. the sentence on Adam, iii. 17-19;

(ix) v. 14, 'face of the ground (E.V. earth),' as in ii. 6;

(x) v. 15, Jehovah 'set a mark upon Cain': comp. the anthropomorphisms in (913);

(xi) v. 16, the name 'Nod' is derived, apparently, from *nad*, 'vagabond,' v. 12, 14: comp. the derivations of Adam, Ishah, Eve, Cain, as in (ii) above;

(xii) v. 16, 'Eden,' as in ii. 8, 10, 15, iii. 23, 24;

(xiii) v. 25, 26, the writer may have adopted the names, 'Seth' and 'Enos,' from the Elohist account in v. 3, 6, if it lay before him, as, perhaps, he has adopted the name 'Adam,' v. 25, from i. 26 or v. 2;

(xiv) v. 25, the name *Sheth*, 'Seth,' derived from *shith*, 'appoint': comp. the derivations of Adam, &c., as above.

CHAPTER III.

ANALYSIS OF GEN. V.1-VII.24.

917. v. 1-32 (except v. 29), *Elohist*.

This section is the continuation of the Elohist narrative, i. 1-ii. 3, to which it refers distinctly, but *not at all* to the Jehovistic passage, ii. 4-iv. 26.

(i) v. 1, 'in the likeness of Elohim made He him': comp. i. 27, 'in the image of Elohim created He him';

(ii) v. 1, 3, 'likeness,' as in i. 26;

(iii) v. 2, 'male and female created He them,' as in i. 27;

(iv) v. 2, 'He blessed them,' as in i. 28;

(v) v. 3, 'in his likeness, after his image': comp. i. 26, 'in our image, after our likeness.'

918. v. 29 is a *Jehovistic* interpolation, as appears—not only from its containing the name 'Jehovah,' but also—from its referring distinctly to the *Jehovistic* section, ii. 4–iv. 26.

(i) 'over our work and over the pain of our hands': comp. the 'work and pain' imposed on Adam in iii. 17–19;

(ii) 'the ground which Jehovah cursed': comp. iii. 17, 'cursed is the ground for thy sake';

(iii) The name *Nodk*, 'Noah,' connected with *nikham*, 'comfort': comp. the derivations of 'Adam,' ii. 7, 'Ishah,' ii. 23, 'Eve,' iii. 20, 'Cain,' iv. 1, 'Nod,' iv. 16, 'Seth,' iv. 25.

N.B.—Probably, the original conclusion of v. 28 was 'and begat Noah,' as in v. 6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21, 25. In v. 3 the Elohist writes, 'and begat [not 'begat a son'] in his likeness, after his image, and called his name *Seth*.' This also suggests that the Elohist would not at any rate have written what now stands in v. 28, 29, 'and begat a son, and called his name Noah.' As said above, he probably wrote 'and begat Noah,' and the *Jehovist*, or some later compiler, has substituted a 'a son' for 'Noah,' in order to introduce his explanation of the name.

919. vi. 1–8, *Jehovistic*.

In v. 5 the E.V. and Latin Vulgate imply *Elohim*: but the Heb., Sam., and all the other ancient versions and Targums have 'Jehovah,' except that the LXX. has 'Jehovah-Elohim.'

Also in v. 2, 4, we find the phrase 'sons of *Elohim*'=angels. But this was the current designation of angels, which any writer, however thoroughly *Jehovistic*, must have used, since the phrase 'sons of Jehovah' is never employed for them.

920. Thus it appears that this section is quite *Jehovistic*, and it connects itself with the previous *Jehovistic* matter, and with that exclusively, by the following links:—

(i) v. 1, 7, 'face of the ground,' as in ii. 6, iv. 14: the partiality of the *Jehovist* for the use of the word *adamah* (911.) is here very strongly marked.—v. 1, 'when man began to multiply on the face of the ground,'—v. 7, 'I will wipe out man from off the face of the ground,'—in both which cases the E.V. has 'earth';

(ii) v. 7, 'from off the face of the ground,' as in iv. 14;

(iii) v. 3, 6, 7, the writer attributes to the Deity human affections, disappointment, change of plan, &c. (913);

(iv) v. 3, 7, 'and Jehovah said': comp. the secret speeches ascribed to Jehovah in ii. 18, iii. 22.

921. vi. 9–22, *Elohistic*, except v. 15, 16.

(i) v. 9, Noah 'walked with *Elohim*,' as in v. 22, 24;

(ii) v. 11, 12 would hardly have been written by one, who had already written v. 5–8;

(iii) v. 12, 'and *Elohim* saw the earth, and behold! it was corrupted': comp. i. 31, 'and *Elohim* saw all that He had made, and behold! it was very good';

(iv) v. 20, 20, 20, 'after his kind,' as in i. 11, 12, 21, &c. (ten times);

(v) v. 20, 'every creeping thing of the ground,' as in i. 25;

922. vi. 15, 16, *Jehovistic*.

These verses appear to be *Jehovistic*: since the *Elohist* seems to have completed his directions for the making of the Ark in v. 14,—

'make it of cypress-wood, make it in cells, pitch it within and without;—

after which we find a fresh set of directions,—

and this is how thou shalt make it, &c.'

It is, however, impossible to speak with perfect confidence here, as the indications are slight, and these last words *might* be understood to mean,—

'This is how thou shalt determine the dimensions of the Ark.'

But after this follow the directions for a 'light' and a 'door,' v. 16, which are here separated from the other *Elohistic* detail in v. 14, 'make it in cells.' Also the *preciseness* of these directions, in v. 15, 16, corresponds much more with the style of the *Jehovist* than with the simple generalisations of the *Elohist*.

923. vii. 1–5, *Jehovistic*.

(i) v. 1, the writer refers to 'the Ark,' as already known, whether referring to the *Elohistic* narrative, or to his own words (?) in vi. 15, 16, or to the well-known Ark of the legend;

(ii) v. 1, 'thou and all thy house': contr. the E. expression, vi. 18, 'thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives, with thee';

(iii) v. 2, 'thou shalt take to thee': contr. the E. expression, vi. 20, 'they shall come unto thee,' i.e. come of themselves; E. says that Noah is to 'take' of the food, and 'gather' it 'to him,' vi. 21;

(iv) v. 4, 'I will wipe out all the substance, which I have made, from off the face of the ground': comp. vi. 7, 'I will wipe out man, whom I have created, from off the face of the ground';

(v) v. 4, 'from off the face of the ground,' as in iv. 14, vi. 7: comp. also 'face of the ground,' ii. 6, vi. 1.

924. As already remarked (203, 204), it is obvious that a discrepancy exists between the *Jehovistic* command in vii. 2, 3,—

'to take by *sevens* of every clean beast and of every fowl,'—
and the Elohist in vi.19,20, that—
'two of every living thing, of fowl, and of cattle, and of creeping thing,'—
should be brought into the Ark. After the above plain exhibition of the difference of the sources, from which the two accounts are derived, it is needless to discuss the various attempts which have been made to 'reconcile' the difficulty.

925. But we will quote the words of KALISCH:

This text not only repeats several of the statements already distinctly made, but, what is more important, it is in one point *irreconcilable with the preceding narrative*. Noah was commanded to take into the Ark *seven* pairs of all clean, and one pair of all unclean, animals, vii.2,3; whereas he had before been ordered to take *one* pair of *every* species, vi. 19,20, no distinction whatever between clean and unclean animals having there been made. All the attempts at arguing away this discrepancy have been utterly unsuccessful. The difficulty is so obvious, that the most desperate efforts have been made. Some regard the second and third verses as the later addition of a pious Israelite; while Rabbinical writers maintain that six pairs were taken by Noah, but one pair came to him spontaneously! Is it necessary to refute such opinions? . . . We appeal to every unbiassed understanding. The Bible cannot be abused to defy common sense, to foster sophistry or perverse reasoning, to cloud the intellect, or to poison the heart with the rank weeds of insincerity.

926. vii.6-9, *Elohist*.

(i) v.6, 'and Noah was a son of six hundred years': comp. v.32, 'and Noah was a son of five hundred years';

(ii) v.6, 'flood of waters,' as in vi.17;

(iii) v.7, 'and he went, Noah, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the Ark': comp. vi.18, 'and thou shalt go into the Ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee'; and *contr.* the J. expression, 'go thou, and all thy house, into the Ark,' vii.1;

(iv) v.8, 'out of the cattle, &c. two, two, they came unto Noah': comp. the same form of sentence, vi.20, 'out of the fowl, &c. two out of all shall come unto thee';

(v) v.8, 'cattle, fowl, all that creepeth upon the ground': comp. the same three classes of creatures, vi.20, 'fowl, cattle, (all=) every creeping-thing of the ground';

(vi) v.8, 'creepeth upon the ground': comp. 'creeping-thing of the ground,' i.25, vi.20;

(vii) v.9, 'two, two,' comp. vi.19,20;

(viii) v.9, 'they came unto Noah': comp. vi. 20, 'shall come unto thee,' and *contr.* the J. expression, 'thou shalt take to thee,' vii.2.

927. vii.10, *Jehovistic*.

'it came to pass after the seven days that the waters of the flood were upon the earth':

comp. vii.4, 'for after yet seven days I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth.'

928. vii.11, *Elohist*.

(i) 'in the six-hundredth year of Noah's life': comp. vii.6, 'Noah was a son of six hundred years';

(ii) 'the fountains of the great deep were broken up, and the windows of heaven were opened': comp. the idea of the waters *beneath*, and the waters *above*, the firmament, i.6,7;

(iii) 'deep,' as in i.2.

929. vii.12, *Jehovistic*.

'and the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights': comp. vii.4, 'I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights.'

Obviously, this Jehovistic statement of the forty days' rain is here inserted awkwardly, out of its proper place in the story. In v.17 it comes in more suitably to the context, *after* the description of Noah and his family going into the Ark on the first day: whereas both v.10 and v.12 interrupt the continuity of the narrative.

930. vii.13-16, *Elohist*.

(i) v.13, 'Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, Noah's wife, and his sons' three wives, with them': comp. vi.10, vii.7, and *contr.* the J. expression, 'thou and all thy house,' vi.1;

(ii) v.14, i.14, i.14, 'after his kind,' as in i.11, 12, &c. (ten times), vi.20,20,20;

(iii) v.14, 'every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth,' as in i.26: comp. also i.28, 'every animal that creepeth upon the earth,' i.30, 'everything creeping upon the earth';

(iv) v.15, 'they came unto Noah into the Ark,' as in vii.9: comp. also 'shall come unto thee,' vi.20, and *contr.* the J. expression, 'thou shalt take unto thee,' vii.2;

(v) v.15,16, 'all flesh,' as in vi.12,13,17,19;

(vi) v.15, 'two, two,' as in vii.9; comp. vi. 19,20;

(vii) v.15, 'all flesh, in which is a spirit of life,' as in vi.17: comp. also i.30, 'all, in which is a living soul';

(viii) v.16, 'male and female,' as in i.27, v. 2, vi.19, vii.9;

(ix) v.16, 'as Elohim commanded him,' evidently closed originally this E. passage, as the like phrase closes the E. passages vi.22, vii.9.

931. In v.13, we read,—

'On that very same day went Noah, &c. into the Ark,'—

i.e., apparently, on the same day that—

'the fountains of the great deep were broken up, &c.' v. 11,

and the Flood began: whereas, according to the Jehovist, v.14—

'and Jehovah said to Noah, Go thou, and all thy house, into the Ark. . . for yet seven days and I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth,'—

it would seem that Noah and his family were to go into the Ark *seven days before* the beginning of the Flood. If it be said that Noah was to go in a week before the Flood, and was to employ the interval in 'taking to him' the animals, v.2,3, so as to go in *finally* on the very same day when the Flood began, yet v.14 appears to say that the animals also went in, together with Noah, on that same day,—
'they, and every beast after its kind, &c.'

932. vii.16^b,17, *Jehovistic*.

(i) v.16^b, 'and Jehovah shut up after him': comp. the J. anthropomorphisms (913);

(ii) v.16^b, reference is here made to the door provided by the Jehovist (?) in vi.16;

(iii) v.17, 'and the Deluge was forty days upon the earth': comp. the very similar form of sentence, v.12, 'and the rain was upon the earth forty days';

(iv) v.17, 'forty days' [LXX 'and forty nights']: comp. the 'forty days and forty nights' of rain, vii.4,12.

N.B. The Elohist says, v.24, that 'the waters were mighty upon the earth 150 days,' and he evidently means that they went on increasing during all this time, since *after* this he says, viii.2, 'the fountains of the deep and the windows of the heaven were stopped.' This seems to show conclusively that v.17^a, 'and the flood was forty days upon the earth,' must belong to the Jehovist. The writer, perhaps, meant it to be understood that the waters stood, at their highest, 15 cubits over 'all the high mountains, that were beneath all the heaven,' v.19, and that the Ark, which was 30 cubits high, vi.15, floated half below the water, so that, when driven by the wind over the mountain-tops, it would just touch the top of Ararat, and ground at once, as soon as the waters fell.

933. vii.18-20, *Jehovistic*, except v.18^a,19^b.

(i) v.18^a,—'and the waters were mighty and multiplied greatly upon the earth,'—appears to be *Elohistic*, since the compound expression, 'be mighty and multiply,' corresponds exactly, *mutatis mutandis*, (for 'fructify' could not be used of the *waters*), to the favourite E. formula, 'fructify and multiply,' which occurs in i.22,28, viii.17, ix.1,7;

(ii) v.19^b, 'under all the heaven' is *Elohistic*: comp. vi.17, 'from under the heaven';

(iii) v.18^b,—'and the Ark went upon the face of the waters,'—appears to be *Jehovistic*, describing a further stage of the action of the waters beyond that mentioned by the Jehovist in v.17^b,—'and the waters multiplied, and they raised the Ark, and it was lifted from off the earth, and the Ark went upon the face of the waters';

(iv) v.19^a is also *Jehovistic*, for a critical reason given in the larger edition (IV.57.i).

N.B. It would seem that in v.20 the Jehovist wished to explain *how* the effect described by E. in v.19^b,—'and all the high mountains, that were under all the heaven, were covered,'

—was brought about, and so he inserted 'fifteen cubits upward the waters were mighty, and the mountains were covered': comp. 'cubits,' vi.15,16, 'upward,' vi.16.

934. vii.21,22, *Elohistic*.

(i) v.21, 'all flesh,' as in vi.12,13,17,19,vii.15,16;

(ii) v.21, 'that creepeth upon the earth,' as in i.28,30,vii.14;

(iii) v.21, 'swarming-things,' 'swarm,' as in i.20,21;

(iv) v.22, 'all in whose nostrils was the breath of a spirit of life': comp. vi.17,vii.15, 'all flesh in which was a spirit of life';

(v) v.22, 'all out of all,' as in viii.17, ix.10.

935. vii.23^a, *Jehovistic*.

These words, as far as 'and they were wiped-out of (E.V. 'destroyed from') the earth,' are a mere repetition of v. 21, and of such a kind, that they could hardly have been penned *immediately after* v.21 by the *same* writer. Accordingly we shall find that they exhibit unmistakable signs of the *Jehovistic* author.

(i) v.23^a, 'and He wiped-out [E.V. 'was destroyed'] all the substance, which was upon the face of the ground, from man unto cattle, unto creeping-thing, and unto fowl of the heaven': comp. vi.7, 'I will wipe out man, whom I have created from off the face of the ground, from man unto cattle, unto creeping-thing, and unto fowl of the heaven,' and vii.4, 'I will wipe out all the substance, which I have made, from off the face of the ground';

(ii) v.23^a, 'substance,' as in vii.4;

(iii) v.23^a, 'face of the ground,' as in ii.6, iv.14, vi.1,7, vii.4.

936. vii.23^b,24, *Elohistic*.

(i) v.23^b, 'that was with him in the ark,' comp. viii.1.

(ii) v.24, 'a hundred and fifty days': see (937 N.B.).

CHAPTER IV.

ANALYSIS OF GEN.VIII.1-XI.26.

937. viii.1,2,3^b,4^b,5, *Elohistic*.

(i) v.1, 'every animal,' as in vii.14;

(ii) v.1, 'every animal, and all the cattle': comp. vii.14;

(iii) v.1, 'that was with him in the ark,' as in vii.23^b;

(iv) v.2^a, 'the fountains of the deep,' 'the windows of heaven,' as in vii.11;

(v) v.2^a, 'deep,' as in i.2, vii.11;

(vi) v.3^b, 'a hundred and fifty days,' as in vii.24;

(vii) v.4, 'in the seventh month, in the seventeenth day of the month,' and v.5, 'in the tenth, in the first of the month': comp. vii.11, 'in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month.'

N.B. Reckoning one month = 30 days, so that 150 days = 5 months, we have the date of the beginning of the flood, 2mo. 17d. (vii. 11) + the time of its continuance, 5mo. (vii.

24, viii. 3) = 7mo. 17d., the time when the ark grounded, viii. 4,—from which it follows that all these notices of time are by the same writer.

938. viii. 2^b, 3^a, 4^a, are *Jehovistic*.

I assent now, for various critical reasons, to the views of HUPFELD (from whom I differed in the larger edition), and assign these passages to the Jehovist, including the words in v. 4^a,

'and the Ark rested . . . upon the mountains of Ararat';

so that the original E. story ran thus—

'And at the end of a hundred and fifty days the waters abated, in the seventh month, on the seventeenth day of the month.'

939. viii. 6-12, *Jehovistic*.

(i) v. 6, 'forty days,' as in vii. 4, 12, 17;

(ii) v. 6, 'window': comp. the direction for making the 'light,' vi. 16, to which the writer evidently refers in this passage, since he speaks of Noah opening 'the window which he had made': comp. also the reference to the 'door,' vi. 16, in vii. 16^b;

(iii) v. 8, 'to see if the waters were lessened, &c.': comp. ii. 19, 'to see what he would call them';

(iv) v. 8, 'from off the face of the ground,' as in iv. 14, vi. 7, vii. 4: comp. also 'face of the ground,' ii. 6, vi. 1, vii. 23;

(v) v. 10, 12, 'seven days,' as in vii. 4, 10: comp. the use of the number 'seven' in iv. 15, 24, vii. 2, 3;

(vi) The Elohist mentions only the *day*, *month*, and *year*, of the most notable events of the flood, vii. 6, 11, viii. 4, 5, 13, 14: the Jehovist marks the stages of its progress by 'seven days' and 'forty days,' vii. 4, 10, 12, 17, viii. 6, 10, 12;

(vii) That we are right in assigning to the Jehovist this section about the raven and dove, is further confirmed by the inconsistency which exists in the data of time, as the story now stands. Between the time when 'the tops of the mountains were seen,' v. 5, on the first day of the *tenth* month, and the time when 'the waters were dried up from off the earth,' v. 13, on the first day of the *first* month (of the next year), would be an interval of *three months* = 90 days. If we deduct the 40 days of waiting, v. 6, we have 50 days remaining for the sending out of the raven and dove; whereas the story plainly implies an interval of 7 days only between each sending, to which might be added 7 days more after the dove was sent out the second time,—making only 21 days altogether.

N.B. It must have been supposed that Noah, either by reason of the *size*, or *situation*, or *construction*, of the window, or because of the elevation of the Ark on the top of Ararat, could not see for himself what was passing upon the plains below.

940. viii. 13-19, *Elohistic*, except v. 13^b.

(i) v. 13, 'in the six hundred and first year': comp. vii. 11, 'in the six hundredth year of Noah's life'; comp. also v. 32, vii. 16;

(ii) v. 13, 'in the first, in the first of the month,' and v. 14, 'in the second month, in

the seven-and-twentieth day of the month': comp. vii. 11, viii. 4, 5;

(iii) v. 16, 'thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee,' as in vi. 18, vii. 7, 13; *contr.* the J. expression, 'thou and all thy house,' vii. 1;

(iv) v. 17, 19, 'every animal,' as in vii. 14, viii. 1;

(v) v. 17, 'every animal that is with thee': comp. viii. 1, 'every animal that was with him';

(vi) v. 17, 'every animal . . . out of all flesh': comp. vi. 19, 'all the living out of all flesh';

(vii) v. 17, 'all flesh,' vi. 12, 13, 17, 19, vii. 15, 16, 21;

(viii) v. 17, 'among fowl and among cattle,' as in vii. 21;

(ix) v. 17, 'every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth,' as in i. 26, vii. 14: comp. also i. 28, 30;

(x) v. 17, 'swarm,' as in i. 20, 21, vii. 21;

(xi) v. 17, 'fructify and multiply,' i. 22, 28;

(xii) v. 18, 'Noah, and his wife, &c.,' as in (iii) above;

(xiii) v. 19, 'everything creeping upon the earth,' as in i. 30.

941. viii. 13^b, *Jehovistic*.

(i) 'face of the ground,' as in ii. 6, iv. 14, vi. 1, 7, vii. 4, 23, viii. 8;

(ii) 'covering' explains, perhaps, the obscure direction in vi. 16, 'in a cubit shalt thou finish it above';

(iii) this statement,—'and Noah removed the covering of the ark, and saw, and behold! the face of the ground was dry,'—introduces into the account, as it now stands, the anomaly, that the Ark was *uncovered* nearly *two months* before Noah and his family and the multitude of animals came out of it, as appears from v. 13, 14.

942. The later *ecclesiastical* year began in the *Spring*. But in the older time the 'Feast of Ingathering' was 'in the *end* of the year,' E.xiii. 16, so that the new year, apparently, began in *Autumn*. It is probable that this more ancient reckoning is observed in this account of the Flood, which in that case began, according to the story, about the middle of the second month, vii. 11, *i.e.* about the beginning of November, and lasted over the five wet and stormy winter months, vii. 24, viii. 3, till the bright days of Spring came round, and the waters were 'dried up from off the earth' during the heat of summer. But then the herbivorous animals, coming out of the Ark in the *second* month (November), viii. 14, would be in want of food till the spring.

943. viii. 20-22, *Jehovistic*.

(i) v. 20, these sacrifices require the 'seven' pairs of clean animals provided by the Jehovist, vii. 2, 3, to which also the expression 'clean cattle' in this verse refers;

(ii) v.21, 'Jehovah smelled the sweet savour': *comp.* the J. anthropomorphisms in (913) vi.3,6,7, vii.16b;

(iii) v.21, 'Jehovah said unto His heart: *comp.* the secret speeches ascribed to Jehovah, ii.18, iii.22, vi.3,7;

(iv) v.21, 'His heart,' as in vi.6;

(v) v.21, 'I will not add to curse again the ground for man's sake': *comp.* iii.17, 'cursed is the ground for thy sake,' v.29, 'about the ground which Jehovah cursed';

(vi) v.21, 'curse the ground': *comp.* the J. curses in iii.14, iv.11, v.29;

(vii) v.21, 'the imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth,' as in vi.5;

944. ix.1-17, *Elohistic*.

(i) v.1, 'and ELOHIM blessed Noah, and his sons': *comp.* the blessing on Adam, i.28, v.2;

(ii) v.1,7, 'fructify and multiply,' as in i.22,28, viii.17;

(iii) v.1, 'fructify, and multiply, and fill the earth,' as in i.28;

(iv) v.2,10,10, 'every animal of the earth,' as in i.30: *contr.* the J. expression, 'every animal of the field,' ii.19,20, iii.1,14;

(v) v.2, 'the fear of you, and the terror of you, shall be upon every animal of the earth, &c.': *comp.* the E. passage i.26,28, 'let them have dominion over fish, fowl, cattle, &c.';

(vi) v.2, 'all that creepeth the ground' (E.V. 'earth'): *comp.* i.25, vi.20, 'every creeping-thing of the ground,' vii.8, 'all that creepeth upon the ground';

(vii) v.2, 'fishes of the sea': *comp.* 'fish of the sea,' i.26,28;

(viii) v.3, 'every creeping-thing that liveth': *comp.* i.21, 'every living soul that creepeth';

(ix) v.3, 'to you it shall be for food,' i.29;

(x) v.3, 'green herb,' as in i.30;

(xi) v.5, 'every animal,' vii.14, viii.1,17,19;

(xii) v.6, 'in the image of Elohim made He man,' as in i.27;

(xiii) v.7, 'swarm,' as in i.20,21, vii.21, viii.17;

(xiv) v.9,11,15, 'my covenant,' as in vi.18;

(xv) v.9,11,17, 'establish a covenant,' vi.18;

(xvi) v.10, 'among fowl and among cattle,' as in vii.21, viii.17;

(xvii) v.10,12,15,16, 'every living soul,' i.21;

(xviii) v.10,12, 'that is with you': *comp.* 'that was with him,' vii.23, viii.1, 'that is with thee,' viii.17;

(xix) v.11,15,15,16,17, 'all flesh,' as in vi.12,13,17,19, vii.15,16,21, viii.17;

(xx) v.15,16, 'remember,' as in viii.1;

(xxi) v.15,16, 'every living soul among all flesh': *comp.* vi.19, 'every living thing out of all flesh,' viii.17, 'every animal . . . out of all flesh.'

945. In ix.3 the Elohist records the permission to eat animal food, as given only *after* the flood, in agreement with his account of the Creation, where we read, i.29—

'And ELOHIM said, Behold, I give you every herb seeding seed, which is on the face of all the earth, and every tree in which is the fruit of a tree seeding seed: to you it shall be for food.'

The Jehovist, however, makes Abel a 'tender of sheep,' iv.2: and though

sheep might, no doubt, have been kept only for the sake of their *wool* or *milk*, yet in iv.4 the firstlings of the flock are sacrificed, and only, or chiefly, their *fat* seems to have been offered. It may be fairly inferred that, according to the Jehovist, the rest was supposed to be eaten afterwards, as in the case of ordinary peace-offerings.

946. ix.18-27, *Jehovistic*.

(i) v.18, 'Ham—he is the father of Canaan,' as in v.22;

(ii) v.20, this notice of the 'beginning' of wine-making corresponds to the similar Jehovistic notices of the beginning of cattle-keeping, iv.20, music, iv.21, working in iron, iv.22, and probably also of sheep-tending and agriculture, iv.2;

(iii) v.25, 'cursed be Canaan': *comp.* the J. curses, iii.14, iv.11, v.29, viii.21;

(iv) v.25, 'a servant of servants shall he (Canaan) be,' v.26,27, 'and Canaan shall be his servant': here there is a play on the name *Kenahan*, 'Canaan,' which is derived from *Kanah*, 'be low, be humble': but *Canaan* really means the low coast country—the 'lowlands,' or its inhabitants, in opposition to *Aram*, the high country or 'highlands';

(v) v.27, the name *yepheth*, 'Japheth,' is played upon, in connection with the verb *yapht*, 'he shall enlarge': *comp.* the J. derivations of names, ii.7,23, iii.20, iv.1,16,25, v.29.

N.B.—'Jehovah' is named the 'Elohim of Shem,' v.26, who [?Elohim or Japheth] 'shall dwell in the tents of Shem,' v.27: but this name is not used in the blessing of Japheth, for which only the general name of the Deity is employed, and not the covenant-name of the God of Shem, and of Shem's offspring, Israel.

947. ix.28,29, *Elohistic*.

These verses refer to the E. datum in vii.6, and they correspond in language with that of the E. genealogy in v.7,8, &c., except that no mention is made of Noah's 'begetting sons and daughters' after the Flood. It would seem that he was supposed to have had only three sons, 'Shem, Ham, and Japheth,' all born before the Flood; and, indeed, we read, in v.19—

'These were the three sons of Noah: and out of them was all the earth overspread.'

948. x.1-32, *Jehovistic*.

(i) v.5, 'out of these were separated the isles,' v.32, 'out of these were separated the nations': *comp.* ix.19, 'out of these were spread-abroad all the earth';

(ii) v.5,32, 'was separated,' as in ii.10;

(iii) v.5,20,31,32: *comp.* these summarising clauses, at the end of the corresponding passages, with ix.19;

(iv) v.18, 'were spread-abroad': *comp.* 'was spread-abroad,' ix.19;

(v) v.21, 'and to Shem—to him also there was born': *comp.* iv.26, 'and to Seth—to him also there was born';

(vi) v.21, 'Shem, the elder brother of Japheth': *comp.* ix.24, 'his younger son';

(vii) v.25, the name 'Peleg,' derived from *palag*, 'divide': *comp.* the J. derivations, ii.7,23,iii.20,iv.1,16,25,v.29,ix.27;

(viii) v.25, 'the earth,' used of the population of the earth, *as in* ix.19;

(ix) The Jehovist in this chapter shows a remarkable amount of geographical and historical knowledge: *comp.* ii.10-14,iv.16,17,viii.4.

949. xi.1-9, *Jehovistic*.

(i) v.1, 'all the earth' = the whole human race, *as in* ix.19;

(ii) v.4, 'let us make to ourselves a name': *comp.* the J. expression, 'men of a name,' vi.4;

(iii) v.4,8,9, 'spread-abroad,' *as in* ix.19,x.18;

(iv) v.4,8,9, 'upon the face of all the earth,' *as in* vii.3,viii.9: the Elohist, however, uses this phrase in i.29;

(v) v.5, 'Jehovah came down to see the city,' and v.7, 'let us go down, and confound their language': *comp.* the J. anthropomorphisms, &c.;

(vi) v.5, 'the sons of man': *comp.* 'the daughters of man,' vi.2;

(vii) v.6, 'and Jehovah said': *comp.* the secret speeches ascribed to Jehovah in ii.18, iii.22,vi.3,7,viii.21;

(viii) v.9, the name 'Babel,' derived from *balal*, 'confound': *comp.* the J. derivations, ii.7,23,iii.20,iv.1,16,25,v.29,ix.27,x.25;

N.B. Apparently, this account of the 'confusion of tongues' and dispersion of mankind is in connection also with the J. statement, x.25, that, in Peleg's days, 'the earth was divided.'

The derivation of 'Babel,' in v.9, is incorrect. There is little doubt now, among scholars, that the word is properly *Bab-Il*, meaning 'House of God.'

950. xi.10-26, *Elohistic*.

This table is plainly a continuation of the E. genealogy in G.v. The Jehovistic account has anticipated it in x.22-25, as to the births of Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, Peleg, just as in iv.25 it anticipated the E. mention of the name of Adam, v.2, and in iv.25,26, the E. mention of Seth and Enos, v.3,6.

(i) v.10, 'These are the generations of Shem': *comp.* vi.9, 'These are the generations of Noah';

(ii) v.10, 'son of a hundred years': *comp.* v.32,vii.6;

(iii) v.11,13,15, &c., 'and Shem lived after begetting . . . and begat sons and daughters': *comp.* the same form of expression, v.7,10,13, &c.;

(iv) v.11,13,15,16, &c., 'and he lived,' *as in* v.3,6,7,9, &c., ix.28.

CHAPTER V.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ELOHIST AND JEHOVIST.

951. We have thus examined the first eleven chapters of Genesis, down to the point where the history of Abraham commences. And we have seen that these chapters may be separated, with reasonable certainty, — so that the general inference, that two hands are traceable, will not be invalidated because a difference of opinion may still fairly exist among scholars as to some minor details,—into two distinct sets of passages, which may now be summed up as follows:—

ELOHISTIC. (E.56,J.0)

i.1-II.3
v.1-28,30-32
vi.9-14,17-22
vii.6-9,11,13-16*,18*,19*,21,22,23*,24
viii.1,2*,3*,4*,5,13*,14-19
ix.1-17,28,29
xi.10-26

JEHOVISTIC. (E.8,J.30,J.E.20)

ii.4-iv.26
v.29
vi.1-8,15,16
vii.1-5,10,12,16*,17,18*,19*,20,23*
viii.2*,3*,4*,6-12,13*,20-22*
ix.18-27,x.1-32
xi.1-9

N.B. Of the 293 verses in G.i.1-xi.26, rather less than half (*viz.* 136) are Elohist, and the rest (*viz.* 157) Jehovistic.

952. We have seen also that these two sets of passages betray incontestable signs of different authorship. In one of them, the name 'Jehovah' never once occurs throughout, whereas Elohim is used 56 times. In the other, 'Jehovah' is the predominant name, being used 50 times, while 'Elohim' ii. occurs 28 times, *viz.* 20 times in the compound name, 'Jehovah-Elohim,' ii.4-iii.24,—(which is found only once besides in the Pentateuch, *viz.* in E.ix.30, for in G.xxiv.3,7, &c., the expression is 'Jehovah, the Elohim of heaven,' &c.)—four times in the mouth of the serpent, iii.1,3,5,5,—twice in the popular expression for angels, 'sons of Elohim,' vi.2,4, for which the writer could not have used 'sons of Jehovah,'—once in stating that Jehovah is the 'Elohim of Shem,' ix.26,—once in speaking of

Elohim blessing Japheth, ix.27, apparently because Japheth was not supposed to stand in any special relation to Jehovah, the Elohim of Shem and of the Hebrew people, Shem's descendants,—and *once* in the words of Eve, iv.25, explaining the meaning of Seth's name.

953. In other words, while the one writer uses constantly the name 'Elohim' and no other, the other writer does not use it *freely*, as the Proper Name of the Divine Being, and scarcely uses it at all, except under special circumstances, which explain in each case his reason for using it. When writing freely, he uses habitually the name 'Jehovah.' It appears, then, that the names 'Elohist' and 'Jehovist' have been applied very justly to distinguish these two writers. But the reader is especially desired to notice that we have not arrived at the conclusions, which have been summed-up above (951), by first *assuming*, as a fact, the existence of this characteristic difference of style, and then assigning to one writer those passages in which the name 'Elohim' occurs predominantly, and those marked by the name 'Jehovah' to the other.

954. On the contrary, we have deduced this characteristic peculiarity itself from an inspection of the two sets of passages already separated. And these have been discriminated, and assigned to their respective authors, by a rigorous process of deduction, from a *great variety* of conspiring peculiarities, which have been detected upon a minute examination and careful comparison of each passage,—a process, which, to our own mind, has the force of an absolute *demonstration*, as we believe it will to most readers, who will be willing to follow it carefully, step by step.

955. In the following chapters we shall give separately, at full length, the Elohist and Jehovistic portions of these first eleven chapters of Genesis, by the consideration of which some of the peculiarities of style and thought which mark the two writers, besides that which is connected with the use of the Divine Name, will be obvious at a glance. We may here, however, mention a few of these, which have either

been already detected in the course of our criticisms, or must be apparent, even to a reader unacquainted with Hebrew, upon a mere perusal and comparison of the two sets of passages.

956. Thus, the Elohist is very *diffuse* and *simple* in his style, and abounds in *repetitions*, as in the use of the clause 'after his kind,' 17 times, i.11,12,21, 24,25,vi.20, vii. 14, or of the formula 'Noah, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him,' vi.18,vii.7, 13,viii.16,18, and in his repeated enumeration of the creatures taken into the Ark,vi.20,vii.8,14,21,viii.17,19. Whereas the Jehovist is more *pointed* and *terse* in his expressions, *e.g.* 'thou and all thy house,' vii.1, more *spirited, ornate, and rhetorical*, iv.6,7,9-15,vi.1-7, viii.21,22; he quotes poetry, iv.23,24, ix.25-27, and a proverb, x.9; he is fond of deriving names, ii.7,23,iii.20,iv.1, 16,25,v.29,ix.27,x.25,xi.9; and his words serve at times to *intensify* the language of the Elohist, as when he expresses the wickedness of man before the Flood, *comp.* vi.5-7 with vi.11-13, or paints the destruction of life occasioned by that catastrophe, *comp.* vii.23^a, with vii.21.

957. The Jehovist also uses frequently *strong anthropomorphisms*, ascribing human actions, passions, and affections to Jehovah. The Elohist has very much less of this, and altogether appears to have had more grand views of the Divine Being, and of His paternal relations to mankind: contrast the whole tone of the Elohist account of the Creation in i.1-ii.3 with that of the Jehovist in ii.4-25. Though the Elohist manifestly had a deep sense of sin and its evil consequences, vi.11-13, yet it is only the Jehovist who introduces 'curses,' iii.14,17,iv.11,v.29,viii.21,ix.25, and writes the story of the 'Fall.'

958. It appears that the Elohist lays stress upon the observance of the sabbath rest, ii.2,3, and the abstinence from the eating of blood, ix.4, and the shedding of man's blood, ix.5,6,—these two last, indeed, having a close connection; since, if blood was too sacred to be eaten, as representing the 'life,' the law of abstinence from it as an article of food would impress upon the people continually the sin of shedding it. On

the other hand, the Jehovist is the only writer who, as yet, has mentioned *sacrifices*, iv.3,4,viii.20,21. Also he makes use repeatedly of the number *seven*, vii.2,3,4,10,viii.10,12, and lays particular stress on the number *forty*, vii.4, 12,17,viii.6, which so often occurs in the subsequent Scripture history.

959. It is not necessary to instance further at present the points which characterise the two writers. But the difference of style, generally, between them cannot possibly be mistaken. When the whole Book of Genesis has been thus analysed, and we are able to complete the separation of the Elohist and Jehovistic portions throughout, we shall be still better able to judge of the distinction between them. Then, also, it will be the proper time to mark in the separate portions any *signs of time*, which may enable us to form some definite conjecture as to the ages in which they were respectively written.

960. In the latter part of Genesis, however, distinct traces are found of, at least, two other writers, so that the work of discrimination is not so easy as we have found it to be in these eleven chapters; and the ground will require to be yet further cleared, before we can proceed in a satisfactory manner with this part of the work. For the present, we content ourselves with the above exhibition of the existence of two different authors in the Book of Genesis,—and these not only *distinct* in style and habits of thought, but involving remarkable discrepancies, as in the two accounts of the Creation (907), in the single pair and seven pairs of clean animals at the Flood (925), and in the statement of the Jehovist that the 'Flood lasted forty days,' vii.4,12,17, whereas the Elohist says that it lasted 150 days, since only *after* the 150 days, vii.24, according to this writer,—

'The fountains of the deep and the windows of the heaven were stopped,' viii.2.

961. But we may here take a glance at the two sets of passages, with a view to consider whether we can arrive at any definite conclusion at present upon one important point. It is agreed generally by critics of note that the *Elohist* document was originally a

complete narrative; and it will be seen presently that, as it now lies before us, separated from the Jehovistic matter, the story of the Elohist is a perfectly consistent whole,—a strong confirmation this of the correctness of our process of division. The question now arises, Did the Jehovist merely interpolate his own additions into the primitive story, or was the Jehovistic document originally a whole by itself?

962. HUFFELD and some other eminent critics are of opinion that it was. They suppose that the two documents, each complete in itself, lay before a later compiler, who put them together into one narrative, in the form in which we now possess them, taking passages out of each as they suited his purpose, or seemed to be worth preserving, in order to give more point and fulness to the story. It is only in this way, they think, that we can account for the existence of such remarkable discrepancies as we find in the two accounts of the Creation and the Deluge. A mere *interpolator* would have avoided such discrepancies; whereas a later editor might consider the data of *both* such venerable documents too precious to be dispensed with altogether, notwithstanding these discrepancies, or may not even have perceived them; as so many devout readers, of ancient and modern times, have studied the story, as it stands, without perceiving them, until their attention had been expressly directed to them.

963. The Jehovistic sections of G.i-xi, however, as they now lie before us, seem hardly sufficient—at least, when taken alone by themselves—to justify the conclusion, that they once formed parts of an independent connected whole. These portions, in fact, of the Jehovistic matter appear rather as enlargements and embellishments of the primitive simple story, by the hand of one who wrote—not in slavish subjection to the contents of the primary document, but—with considerable freedom and independence.

964. And this seems true even of the second account of the Creation, on which HUFFELD lays much stress in support of his own position. It is

quite as easy to conceive that the Jehovahist himself may not have perceived the discrepancies, which in this passage, as well as in those about the Flood, he has imported into the narrative, as it is to imagine this in the case of a later editor,—more especially when we take into account the difficulty in any case of mastering completely all the minute details of a story, written by another hand. It is almost impossible, indeed, for one writer to place himself so accurately in relation to the age and circumstances of another, as to be able to regard the same subject from exactly the same point of view; and it might be expected that any author, who would undertake to illustrate and amplify a narrative like that of the Elohist, would fall inevitably, now and then, into contradictions, which a close examination might detect. This might be looked for under the most favourable circumstances, if the interpolator had had the prime narrative before him, in clear roman type, in a printed volume. How much more, it may be said, when we take into account the difficulty of studying that narrative out of a long roll, consisting of many sheets, stitched together, of papyrus or parchment manuscript!

965. Upon the whole, we must reserve our judgment on this point until the analysis has been carried further, and more of the Jehovistic matter lies before us. But we are justified, at all events, in concluding, from the evidence at present before us, that the Jehovistic writer—whether we regard him as the writer of a complete independent narrative, or merely as the interpolator of the primary Elohist document,—was one who wrote with considerable independence and boldness of thought, and who felt himself in no way bound to adhere scrupulously to the details of the original story, or to maintain with it a perfect unity of style, any more than of sentiment. We have thus, to some extent, a confirmation of the view which has been already expressed (in II.490), as to the composition of the Pentateuch.

966. But we have more than this. The analysis, *as far as we have gone*, confirms the statement in (II.337) that

the Elohist never mentions the name 'Jehovah,' until he records the revelation of it to Moses. From this it would seem that the words in E.vi.3,—'by my name Jehovah was I not known to them—'

are really meant to imply that, in the view of this writer, the *Name* itself—and not merely the *full* meaning of it—was unknown before the time of Moses. And this result conflicts, of course, with the view of the Jehovahist, who puts it in the mouth of Eve, iv.1, and says, iv.26, that from the time of Enos—'it was begun to call upon the name of Jehovah.'

CHAPTER VI.

THE ELOHISTIC AND JEHOVISTIC PASSAGES IN G.I.1—XI.26.

967. WE shall now exhibit in full the portions of G.i.1—xi.26, which appear to us to belong to the Elohist and Jehovahist, respectively. In order to set more distinctly before the eyes of the English reader the agreements and variations in style, which have been noted in our preceding critical enquiry, it has been necessary to translate these chapters again from the original, taking care to render, as far as possible, the same Hebrew word or phrase always by the same English equivalent,—a rule which is very often not observed in the authorised version. Thus in *nine* places (i.25, iv.11, 14, vi.1, 7, 20, vii.4, 8, ix.2) the original has 'the ground,' where the E.V. has 'the earth,' whereas the E.V. has correctly 'the ground' in *seventeen* other places, ii.5, 6, 7, 9, &c. So the same Hebrew word is expressed by 'move' in i.21, 28, vii.21, and by 'creep' in i.26, 30, vii.8, 14, viii.17, 19, and the corresponding noun, by 'creeping thing' in *nine* places, i.24, 25, 26, &c., and by 'moving thing' in ix.3.

968. It is obvious that, without uniformity of translation, no accurate comparison can be instituted between the two documents in English.

On this account it has been necessary to translate *as literally* as possible; and so the following version does not pretend to be an elegant, but only a strictly faithful, representation of the original.

N.B.—The sign ✕ denotes that a Jehovistic or Elohist passage has been removed.

THE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE.

1. (1) In the beginning ELOHIM created the Heaven and the Earth. (2) And the Earth was desolation and emptiness, and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of ELOHIM hovering upon the face of the waters.

(3) And ELOHIM said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light. (4) And ELOHIM saw the light that *it was* good; and ELOHIM divided between the light and (between) the darkness. (5) And ELOHIM called (to) the light 'Day,' and (to) the darkness He called 'Night.' And it was evening, and it was morning,—one day.

(6) And ELOHIM said, 'Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it be dividing between waters (to) and waters.' (7) And ELOHIM made the expanse, and divided between the waters which *were* beneath the expanse, (between) and the waters which *were* above the expanse; and it was so. (8) And ELOHIM called (to) the expanse 'Heaven.' And it was evening, and it was morning,—a second day.

(9) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the waters beneath the Heaven be gathered into one place, and let the dry-land appear'; and it was so.

(10) And ELOHIM called (to) the dry-land 'Earth,' and (to) the gathering of waters called He 'Seas'; and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good.

(11) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the Earth vegetate vegetation, the herb seedling seed, the fruit-tree making fruit, after its kind, whose seed *is* in it, upon the Earth'; and it was so.

(12) And the Earth brought forth vegetation, the herb seedling seed after its kind, and the tree making fruit, whose seed *is* in it, after its kind; and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good.

(13) And it was evening, and it was morning,—a third day.

(14) And ELOHIM said, 'Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the Heaven, to divide between the day and (between) the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years; (15) and let them be for luminaries in the expanse of the Heaven, to give light upon the Earth': and it was so. (16) And ELOHIM made the two great luminaries,—the greater luminary for the rule of the day, and the lesser luminary for the rule of the night,—and the stars. (17) And ELOHIM (gave) placed them in the expanse of the Heaven, to give light upon the Earth, (18) and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide between the light and (between) the darkness: and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good. (19) And it was evening, and it was morning,—a fourth day.

(20) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the waters swarm with swarming-things of living soul, and let fowl fly over the Earth upon the face of the expanse of the Heaven.' (21) And ELOHIM created the great monsters, and every living soul that creepeth, which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every fowl of wing after its kind: and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good. (22) And ELOHIM blessed them, saying, 'Fructify and multiply, and fill the

waters in the Seas, and let the fowl abound in the Earth.' (23) And it was evening, and it was morning,—a fifth day.

(24) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the Earth bring forth living soul after its kind, cattle, and creeping-thing, and animal of the Earth after its kind'; and it was so. (25) And ELOHIM made the animal of the Earth after its kind, and the cattle after its kind, and every creeping-thing of the ground after its kind: and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good.

(26) And ELOHIM said, 'Let us make man, in our image, after our likeness; and let them (tread) have-dominion over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the Heaven, and over the cattle, and over every animal of the Earth, and over every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the Earth.' (27) And ELOHIM created man in His image; in the image of ELOHIM created He him; male and female created He them. (28) And ELOHIM blessed them, and ELOHIM said to them, 'Fructify, and multiply, and fill the Earth, and subdue it; and (tread) have-dominion over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the Heaven, and over every animal that creepeth upon the Earth.' (29) And ELOHIM said, 'Behold! I give to you every herb seedling seed, which *is* on the face of all the Earth, and every tree in which *is* the fruit of a tree seedling seed; to you it shall be for food: (30) and to every animal of the Earth, and to every fowl of the Heaven, and to everything creeping upon the Earth, in which *is* a living soul, I give every green herb for food'; and it was so. (31) And ELOHIM saw all that He had made, and behold! *it was* very good. And it was evening, and it was morning,—the sixth day.

2. (1) And the Heaven and the Earth were finished, and all their host. (2) And ELOHIM finished on the seventh day His work which He had made, and rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. (3) And ELOHIM blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; for on it He rested from all His work, which ELOHIM created (to make) and made.✕

5. (1) This is the book of the generations of Adam, in the day of ELOHIM's creating Adam; in the likeness of ELOHIM made He him. (2) Male and female He created them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam in the day of their creation.

(3) And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat in his likeness, according to his image; and he called his name Seth. (4) And the days of Adam, after his begetting Seth, were eight hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. (5) And all the days of Adam which he lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died.

(6) And Seth lived an hundred and five years, and begat Enos. (7) And Seth lived, after his begetting Enos, eight hundred and seven years, and he begat sons and daughters. (8) And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years, and he died.

(9) And Enos lived ninety years, and begat Kenan. (10) And Enos lived, after his begetting Kenan, eight hundred and fifteen years, and he begat sons and daughters. (11) And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years, and he died.

(¹³) And Kenan lived seventy years, and begat Mahalaleel. (¹⁴) And Kenan lived, after his begetting Mahalaleel, eight hundred and forty years, and he begat sons and daughters. (¹⁵) And all the days of Kenan were nine hundred and ten years, and he died.

(¹⁶) And Mahalaleel lived sixty-and-five years, and begat Jared. (¹⁷) And Mahalaleel lived, after his begetting Jared, eight hundred and thirty years, and he begat sons and daughters. (¹⁸) And all the days of Mahalaleel were eight hundred and ninety-five years, and he died.

(¹⁹) And Jared lived an hundred and sixty-two years, and begat Enoch. (²⁰) And Jared lived, after his begetting Enoch, eight hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. (²¹) And all the days of Jared were nine hundred and sixty-two years, and he died.

(²²) And Enoch lived sixty-and-five years, and begat Methuselah. (²³) And Enoch walked with ELOHIM*, after his begetting Methuselah, three hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. (²⁴) And all the days of Enoch were three hundred and sixty-five years. (²⁵) And Enoch walked with ELOHIM, and he was not, for ELOHIM took him.

(²⁶) And Methuselah lived an hundred and eighty-seven years, and begat Lamech. (²⁷) And Methuselah lived, after his begetting Lamech, seven hundred and eighty-two years, and he begat sons and daughters. (²⁸) And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred and sixty-nine years, and he died.

(²⁹) And Lamech lived an hundred and eighty-two years, and begat [Noah].✠(³⁰) And Lamech lived, after his begetting Noah, five hundred and ninety-five years, and he begat sons and daughters. (³¹) And all the days of Lamech were seven hundred and seventy-seven years, and he died.

(³²) And Noah was a son of five hundred years, and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.✠

6. (¹) These are the generations of Noah.

Noah was a man just and perfect in his generations: Noah walked with ELOHIM. (²) And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. (³) And the earth was corrupted before the face of ELOHIM, and the earth was filled with violence. (⁴) And ELOHIM saw the earth, and behold! it was corrupted; for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth.

(⁵) And ELOHIM said to Noah, 'The end of all flesh has come before my face; for the earth is full of violence from before them; and behold! I will (corrupt) destroy them with the earth. (⁶) Make to thee an Ark of cypress-wood; in cells shalt thou make the Ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch.✠(⁷) And I, behold! I (am bringing) will bring the Flood of waters upon the earth, to (corrupt) destroy all flesh in which is a spirit of life from under the heaven; all which is in the earth shall die. (⁸) But I establish my covenant with thee; and thou shalt go into the Ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee. (⁹)

And out of every living thing out of all flesh, two out of all shalt thou bring into the Ark, to keep-alive with thee; male and female shall they be. (¹⁰) Out of the fowl after its kind, and out of the cattle after its kind, out of every creeping-thing of the ground after its kind, two out of all shall come unto thee, to keep-alive. (¹¹) And thou, take to thee out of all food which is eaten, and thou shalt gather it unto thee, and it shall be to thee and to them for food.'

(¹²) And Noah did according to all which ELOHIM commanded him—so did he.✠

7. (¹) And Noah was a son of six hundred years, when the Flood was of waters upon the earth. (²) And he went, Noah, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives, with him, into the Ark, from the face of the waters of the Flood. (³) Out of the clean cattle and out of the cattle which are not clean, and out of the fowl and all that creepeth upon the ground, (⁴) two and two, they came unto Noah into the Ark, male and female, as ELOHIM commanded Noah.✠

(⁵) In the six-hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, on this day were broken up all the fountains of the great deep, and the windows of the heaven were opened.✠(⁶) On this very same day, (*lit.* in the bone of this day,) went Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, Noah's sons, and Noah's wife, and his sons' three wives with them, into the Ark; (⁷) they, and every animal after its kind, and all the cattle after its kind, and every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and all the fowl after its kind, every bird of every wing. (⁸) And they came unto Noah into the Ark, two and two, out of all flesh, in which is a spirit of life. (⁹) And those coming, male and female out of all flesh they came, as ELOHIM commanded him.✠

(¹⁰) And the waters were mighty, and multiplied (very) greatly upon the earth,✠(¹¹) and all the high mountains that were under all the heaven, were covered. (¹²) And all flesh died, that creepeth upon the earth, among fowl, and among cattle, and among (animal) animals, and among all the swarming-things that swarm upon the earth, and all man. (¹³) All in whose nostrils was the breath of a spirit of life, out of all which was in the dry land, died. ✠(¹⁴) And only Noah was left, and what was with him in the Ark.

(¹⁵) And the waters were mighty upon the earth a hundred and fifty days.✠

8. (¹) And ELOHIM remembered Noah, and every animal, and all the cattle, that was with him in the Ark; and ELOHIM caused-to-pass a wind upon the earth, and the waters subsided. (²) And the fountains of the deep were stopped and the windows of the heaven; ✠(³) and the waters decreased at the end of a hundred and fifty days,✠(⁴) in the seventh month, in the seventeenth day of the month. ✠(⁵) And the waters were decreasing continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, in the first of the month, the tops of the mountains were seen.✠

(⁶) And it came-to-pass in the six hun-

* We shall print the name thus, in large capitals, whenever it occurs in the original with the article.

dred and first year, in the first month, in the first of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth: ✕ ('') and in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, the earth was dry.

('') And ELOHIM spake unto Noah, saying, ('') 'Go out from the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives, with thee. ('') Every animal that is with thee out of all flesh, among fowl, and among cattle, and among every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth, bring forth with thee; and let them swarm in the earth, and fructify, and multiply, upon the earth.' ('') And he went out, Noah, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives, with him. ('') Every animal, every creeping-thing, and every fowl, everything creeping upon the earth,—after their families, they went out from the Ark. ✕

9. ('') And ELOHIM blessed Noah and his sons, and said to them, 'Fructify, and multiply, and fill the earth. (') And the fear of you and the terror of you shall be upon every animal of the earth, and upon every fowl of the heaven, among all that creepeth the ground, and among all the fishes of the sea: into your hand they are given. (') Every creeping-thing that liveth, to you it shall be for food: as the green herb, I give to you all. (') Only flesh (in) with its soul, its blood, ye shall not eat. (') And surely your blood of your souls will I require: from the hand of every animal will I require it, and from the hand of man; from the hand of a man's brother, will I require the soul of man. (') Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of ELOHIM made He man. (') And you, fructify and multiply, swarm in the earth, and multiply in it.'

('') And ELOHIM said unto Noah, and unto his sons with him, saying: (') 'And I, behold! I (*am* establishing) will establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you, ('') and with every living soul which is with you, among fowl, and among cattle, and among (every animal) all animals of the earth with you, from all going out of the Ark to every animal of the earth. ('') And I establish my covenant with you, and all flesh shall not be again cut off through the waters of the Flood, and there shall not be again a Flood to (corrupt) destroy the earth.'

('') And ELOHIM said, 'This is the sign of the covenant, which I (*am* giving) will make between me and (between) you, and (between) every living soul that is with you for perpetual generations. ('') My bow do I (give) set in the cloud, and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between me and (between) the earth. ('') And it shall be, at my (clouding) bringing a cloud upon the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud. ('') And I will remember my covenant which is between me and (between) you and (between) every living soul among all flesh; and there shall not be again the waters for a Flood to (corrupt) destroy all flesh. ('') And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will see it, for a remembrance of the perpetual covenant between ELOHIM and (between) every living soul among all flesh that is upon the earth.'

('') And ELOHIM said unto Noah, 'This is the sign of the covenant, which I establish between me and (between) all flesh that is upon the earth.' ✕

('') And Noah lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years. ('') And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years, and he died. ✕

11. ('') These are the generations of Shem.

Shem was a son of a hundred years, and begat Arphaxad two years after the Flood. ('') And Shem lived, after his begetting Arphaxad, five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Arphaxad lived five and thirty years, and begat Salah. ('') And Arphaxad lived, after his begetting Salah, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Salah lived thirty years, and begat (Heber) Eber. ('') And Salah lived, after his begetting Eber, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Eber lived four and thirty years, and begat Peleg. ('') And Eber lived, after his begetting Peleg, four hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Peleg lived thirty years, and begat Reu. ('') And Peleg lived, after his begetting Reu, two hundred and nine years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Reu lived two and thirty years, and begat Serug. ('') And Reu lived, after his begetting Serug, two hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Serug lived thirty years, and begat Nahor. ('') And Serug lived, after his begetting Nahor, two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Nahor lived nine and twenty years, and begat Terah. ('') And Nahor lived, after his begetting Terah, a hundred and nineteen years, and begat sons and daughters.

('') And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

THE JEHOVISTIC PASSAGES.

2. ('') [*These are the generations of the Heaven and the Earth in their creation*] in the day of JEHOVAH-ELOHIM's making Earth and Heaven. (') And no plant of the field was yet in the earth, and no shrub of the field yet sprouted; for JEHOVAH-ELOHIM had not made-it-rain on the earth, and man *was* not, to till the ground. (') And a mist rose from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground.

('') And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM formed the man of dust out of the ground, and breathed in his nostrils breath of life, and the man became a living soul. (') And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM planted a garden in Eden eastward, and placed there the man whom He had formed. (') And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM made-to-sprout out of the ground every tree pleasant for sight and good for food, and the tree of life in the midst of the garden, and the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

('') And a river goeth out from Eden to water the garden, and from thence it is separated, and becomes four heads. ('') The name

of the first is *Pison*: that *is it* which boundeth the whole land of Havilah, where *is* the gold; ⁽¹²⁾ and the gold of that land *is* good; there is the bdellium and the onyx-stone. ⁽¹³⁾ And the name of the second river is *Gihon*: that *is it* which boundeth the whole land of Cush. ⁽¹⁴⁾ And the name of the third river is *Hiddekel*: that *is it* which goeth eastward of Assyria. And the fourth river—that *is* Euphrates.

⁽¹⁵⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM took the man, and left him in the garden of Eden, to till it and to keep it. ⁽¹⁶⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM charged upon the man, saying, 'Of every tree of the garden eating thou shalt eat: ⁽¹⁷⁾ but of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil—thou shalt not eat of it; for, in the day of thy eating of it, dying thou shalt die.'

⁽¹⁸⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said, '*It is* not good, the man's being alone-by-himself: I will make for him a help over-against-him.'

⁽¹⁹⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM formed out of the ground every animal of the field and every fowl of the heaven, and brought *it* to the man, to see what he would call it; and whatsoever the man would call it, the living soul—that *should be* its name. ⁽²⁰⁾ And the man called names to all the cattle, and to the fowl of the heaven, and to every animal of the field; but for (Adam) the man he found not (i.e. one found not—there was not found) a help over-against-him.

⁽²¹⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM made-to-fall a deep slumber upon the man, and he slept, and He took one of his ribs, and closed up the flesh in-its-place. ⁽²²⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM built the rib, which He took out of the man, into a woman, and brought her to the man. ⁽²³⁾ And the man said, 'This-time this *is* bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: to this it shall be called Woman (*Ishah*), for out of Man (*Ish*) was this taken. ⁽²⁴⁾ Therefore shall a man forsake his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife, and they shall become one flesh.'

⁽²⁵⁾ And they were both of them naked, the man and his wife, and were not ashamed.

3. ⁽¹⁾ And the serpent was subtle, out of (every animal) all animals of the field, which JEHOVAH-ELOHIM had made: and he said unto the woman, '*Is it so* that ELOHIM has said, 'Ye shall not eat of every tree of the garden?'

⁽²⁾ And the woman said unto the serpent, 'Of the fruit of the trees of the garden we shall eat: ⁽³⁾ but of the fruit of the tree, which *is* in the midst of the garden, ELOHIM has said, 'Ye shall not eat of it, and ye shall not touch it, lest ye die.' ⁽⁴⁾ And the serpent said unto the woman, 'Ye shall not (dying) surely die: ⁽⁵⁾ for ELOHIM knows that, in the day of your eating of it, your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as ELOHIM, knowing good and evil.' ⁽⁶⁾ And the woman saw that the tree was good for food, and that it was a longing to the eyes, and the tree was pleasant to behold; and she took of its fruit, and ate, and gave also to her husband with her, and he ate. ⁽⁷⁾ And the eyes of them both were opened, and they knew that they were naked; and they sewed together fig-leaves, and made to themselves girdles.

⁽⁸⁾ And they heard the (voice) sound of JEHOVAH-ELOHIM, walking in the garden in

the breeze of the day; and he hid himself, the man, and his wife, from the face of JEHOVAH-ELOHIM in the midst of the trees of the garden. ⁽⁹⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM called unto the man, and said to him, 'Where art thou?' ⁽¹⁰⁾ And he said, 'Thy (voice) sound I heard in the garden, and I feared, for *I am* naked, and I hid myself.' ⁽¹¹⁾ And He said, 'Who told to thee that thou art naked? Of the tree, which I commanded thee not to eat of, hast thou eaten?' ⁽¹²⁾ And the man said, 'The woman, whom Thou didst (give) place with me, she gave to me of the tree, and I ate.' ⁽¹³⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said to the woman, 'What is this *which* thou hast done?' And the woman said, 'The serpent beguiled me, and I ate.'

⁽¹⁴⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said unto the serpent, 'Because thou hast done this, cursed art thou out of all the cattle and out of (every animal) all animals of the field; upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat, all the days of thy life: ⁽¹⁵⁾ and enmity will I put between thee and (between) the woman, and between thy seed and (between) her seed; it shall bruise thee *on* the head, and thou shalt bruise it *on* the heel.'

⁽¹⁶⁾ Unto the woman He said, 'Multiplying I will multiply thy pain and thy conception; in pain shalt thou bear children, and unto thy husband *shall be* thy desire, and he shall rule over thee.'

⁽¹⁷⁾ And to Adam He said, 'Because thou hast listened to the voice of thy wife, and hast eaten of the tree, *as to* which I commanded thee, saying, "Thou shalt not eat of it," cursed *is* the ground for thy sake; in pain shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; ⁽¹⁸⁾ and thorns and thistles shall it make-to-sprout to thee, and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; ⁽¹⁹⁾ in the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread until thy returning unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken; for dust art thou, and unto dust shalt thou return.'

⁽²⁰⁾ And the man called the name of his wife Eve (*Khavvah*), for she was the mother of all living (*khay*).

⁽²¹⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM made to Adam and to his wife coats of skin, and clothed them.

⁽²²⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM said, 'Behold! the man has become as one of us, for the knowledge of good and evil: and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live for ever. . . ' ⁽²³⁾ And JEHOVAH-ELOHIM put him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken. ⁽²⁴⁾ And He drove-away the man, and stationed eastward (?) in front of the garden of Eden the cherubs and the flame of the turning sword, to keep the way of the tree of life.

4. ⁽¹⁾ And the man knew Eve his wife, and she conceived and bare (Kain) Cain, and she said, 'I have acquired (*Kanithi*), a man with JEHOVAH.' ⁽²⁾ And she added to bear his brother Abel; and Abel was a tender of sheep, and Cain was a tiller of ground.

⁽³⁾ And it came to pass at the end of days that Cain brought of the fruit of the ground an offering to JEHOVAH. ⁽⁴⁾ And Abel brought, he also, of the firstlings of his flock and of

their fat. And JEHOVAH had respect unto Abel and unto his offering; (4) and unto Cain and unto his offering He had not respect: and it (*anger*) was (very) greatly kindled to Cain, and his face fell. (5) And JEHOVAH said unto Cain, 'Why has it been kindled to thee, and why has thy face fallen?' (6) Is there not, if thou do well, (lifting up) acceptance? and if thou doest not well, sin is crouching at the entrance, and unto thee is its desire; but thou shalt rule over it.'

(7) And Cain said (i.e. said in his heart= designed) against (unto) Abel his brother; and it came to pass, in their being in the field, that Cain rose (unto) against Abel his brother, and slew him.

(8) And JEHOVAH said unto Cain, 'Where is Abel thy brother?' And he said, 'I know not; am I keeping my brother?' (9) And He said, 'What hast thou done? The voice of thy brother's blood is crying unto me out of the ground. (10) And now, cursed art thou out of the ground, which opened her mouth to take thy brother's blood from thy hand. (11) When thou tillest the ground, it shall not add to give her strength to thee: a fugitive and a vagabond shalt thou be in the earth.' (12) And Cain said unto JEHOVAH, 'My iniquity is too great to forgive, (or 'My punishment is too great to bear.')

(13) Behold! Thou hast driven me away this day from being upon the face of the ground, and from Thy face shall I hide myself, and I shall be a fugitive and a vagabond in the earth, and it will be that anyone finding me will slay me.'

(14) And JEHOVAH said to him, 'Therefore as to anyone slaying Cain, he (Cain) shall be avenged sevenfold.' And JEHOVAH set on (or 'to') Cain a mark, that anyone finding him might not smite him.

(15) And Cain went out from the presence of JEHOVAH, and dwelt in the land of Nod, eastward of Eden. (16) And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived, and bare Enoch; and he was building a city, and he called the name of the city after the name of his son, Enoch. (17) And there was born to Enoch Irad; and Irad begat Mehujael, and Mehujael begat Methusael, and Methusael begat Lamech.

(18) And Lamech took to him two wives, the name of the one Adah, and the name of the second Zillah. (19) And Adah bare Jabal: he was the father of dwellers in tents and among cattle. (20) And the name of his brother was Jubal: he was the father of all handling lyre and flute. (21) And Zillah—she also bare Tubal-Cain, a forger of all instruments of brass and iron; and the sister of Tubal-Cain was Naamah.

(22) And Lamech said to his wives:

'Adah and Zillah, hear my voice!

Wives of Lamech, give ear to my speech!

For I have slain a man for my wound,

And a youth for my hurt.

(23) For Cain shall be avenged seven-times, And Lamech seventy-times seven-times.'

(24) And Adam knew again his wife, and she bare a son, and she called his name (Sheth) Seth; 'for ELOHIM,' said she, 'hath appointed (*shath*) to me other seed in place of Abel, for Cain slew him.'

(25) And to Seth,—to him also, there was

born a son, and he called his name Enos. Then was it begun to call upon the name of JEHOVAH.✠

5. (26) And he called his name (*Noakh*) Noah, saying, 'This shall comfort (*nikhām*) us (from) about our work and (from) about the pain of our hands, (from) about the ground which JEHOVAH cursed.'

6. (1) And it came-to-pass that man began to multiply upon the face of the ground, and daughters were born to them. (2) And the sons of ELOHIM saw the daughters of man that they were goodly: and they took to them wives of all whom they chose. (3) And JEHOVAH said, 'My spirit shall not preside in man for ever, forasmuch as he also is flesh, and his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.'

(4) The giants were in the earth in those days; and also afterwards, as the sons of ELOHIM went unto the daughters of man, and begat to themselves, these were the mighty-ones which were of old, the men of a name.

(5) And JEHOVAH saw that the wickedness of man was multiplied in the earth, and every (formation) imagination of the thoughts of his heart was only evil all the days. (6) And JEHOVAH repented that He had made man in the earth, and He was pained (unto) in His heart. (7) And JEHOVAH said, 'I will wipe-out man, whom I have created, from off the face of the ground, from man unto cattle, unto creeping-thing, and unto fowl of the heaven; for I repent that I have made them.'

(8) But Noah found favour in the eyes of JEHOVAH.✠

(9) And this is how thou shalt make it,—three hundred cubits the length of the ark, fifty cubits its breadth, and thirty cubits its height. (10) A light shalt thou make to the Ark, and unto a cubit shalt thou finish it upward, and a door of the Ark shalt thou place in its side: lower, second, and third stories shalt thou make it.✠

7. (1) And JEHOVAH said to Noah, 'Go thou and all thy house into the Ark; for thee do I see righteous before my face in this generation. (2) Out of all the clean cattle thou shalt take to thee seven and seven, the male and his mate, (*lit.* man and his woman); and out of the cattle, which are not clean, it shall be two, the male and his mate. (3) Also out of the fowl of the heaven seven and seven, male and female, to keep-alive seed upon the face of all the earth. (4) For after yet seven days I will cause-it-to-rain upon the earth forty days and forty nights; and I will wipe-out all the substance which I have made from off the face of the ground.'

(5) And Noah did according to all which JEHOVAH commanded him.✠

(6) And it came-to-pass after the seven days that the waters of the Deluge were upon the earth.✠ (7) And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights.

(8) And JEHOVAH shut after him. (9) And the Flood was forty days upon the earth; and the waters multiplied, and they raised the Ark, and it was lifted from off the earth.

✕^(10b) And the Ark went upon the face of the waters. ^(10a) And the waters were very, very mighty upon the earth; ✕^(10c) fifteen cubits upward the waters were mighty, and the mountains were covered. ✕^(20a) And He wiped-out all the substance which *was* upon the face of the ground, from man unto cattle, unto creeping-thing, and unto fowl of the heaven; and they were wiped-out from the earth.

8. ^(2b) And the rain was restrained out of the heaven; ^(2a) and the waters returned from off the earth, returning continually; ✕^(2c) and the Ark rested. ✕^(4c) on the mountains of Ararat. ✕

⁽⁴⁾ And it came-to-pass, at the end of forty days, that Noah opened the window of the Ark, which he had made. ⁽⁷⁾ And he put forth the raven, and it went-out, going-out and returning, until the drying-up of the waters from off the earth. ⁽⁸⁾ And he put-forth the dove from him, to see whether the waters were lightened from off the face of the ground. ⁽⁹⁾ And the dove found not rest for the sole of its foot, and it returned unto him unto the Ark; for waters *were* upon the face of all the earth; and he put-forth his hand, and took it, and brought it unto him into the Ark. ⁽¹⁰⁾ And he stayed yet seven other days, and he added to put-forth the dove out of the Ark. ⁽¹¹⁾ And the dove came unto him at the time of evening, and behold! an olive-leaf torn-off in its mouth; and Noah knew that the waters were lightened from off the earth. ⁽¹²⁾ And he stayed yet seven other days, and he put-forth the dove; and it added not to return unto him again. ✕^(12b) And Noah removed the covering of the Ark, and saw, and behold! the face of the ground was dry. ✕

^(20a) And Noah built an altar to JEHOVAH, and took out of all the clean cattle and out of all the clean fowl, and offered burnt-offerings (by-means-of) on the altar. ⁽²¹⁾ And JEHOVAH smelt the sweet savour, and JEHOVAH said unto His heart, 'I will not add to curse again the ground for the sake of man; for the (formation) imagination of the heart of man is evil from his youth; and I will not add again to smite (all living=) every living-thing, as I have done. ⁽²²⁾ Still all the days of the earth, seed and harvest, and cold and heat, and summer and winter, and day and night, shall not cease.' ✕

9. ⁽¹⁴⁾ And the sons of Noah, those going out of the Ark, were Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and Ham—he is the father of Canaan. ⁽¹⁵⁾ These *were* the three sons of Noah, and out of these was spread-abroad all the earth.

⁽²⁰⁾ And Noah began to be a man of the ground, and he planted a vineyard. ⁽²¹⁾ And he drank of the wine, and was drunken, and he exposed-himself in the midst of his tent.

⁽²²⁾ And Ham, the father of Canaan, saw his father's nakedness, and he told it to his two brethren without. ⁽²³⁾ And Shem and Japheth took the garment, and laid it upon the shoulder of both of them, and they went backwards, and covered their father's nakedness; and their faces were backwards, and their father's nakedness they saw not.

⁽²⁴⁾ And Noah awoke from his wine, and he knew what his younger son had done to him. ⁽²⁵⁾ And he said:

'Cursed be Canaan!
Servant of servants shall he be to his brethren.'

⁽²⁶⁾ And he said:

'Blessed be JEHOVAH, the ELOHIM of Shem!

And Canaan shall be a servant to them.

⁽²⁷⁾ ELOHIM shall enlarge Japheth;

And he (? But He) shall dwell in the tents of Shem;

And Canaan shall be a servant to them.' ✕

10. ⁽¹⁾ And these *are* the generations of the sons of Noah,—Shem, Ham, and Japheth; and there were born to them sons after the Deluge.

⁽²⁾ The sons of Japheth, Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras.

⁽³⁾ And the sons of Gomer, Ashkenaz and Riphath, and Togarmah.

⁽⁴⁾ And the sons of Javan, Elisha and Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanim.

⁽⁵⁾ Out of these were separated the isles of the nations in their lands, (man) each after his tongue, after their families, in their nations.

⁽⁶⁾ And the sons of Ham, Cush, and Mizraim, and Phut, and Canaan.

⁽⁷⁾ And the sons of Cush, Seba, and Havilah, and Sabtah, and Raamah, and Sabtechah; and the sons of Raamah, Sheba, and Dedan.

⁽⁸⁾ And Cush begat Nimrod; he began to be a mighty-one in the earth. ⁽⁹⁾ He was a mighty-one in hunting before the face of JEHOVAH: therefore it is said, 'As Nimrod, the mighty-one in hunting before the face of JEHOVAH.' ⁽¹⁰⁾ And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. ⁽¹¹⁾ Out of that land he went out to (Asshur) Assyria, and built Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Hir, and Calah, ⁽¹²⁾ and Resen between Nineveh and (between) Calah: that is the great city.

⁽¹³⁾ And Mizraim begat Ludim, and Anamim, and Lehavim, and Naphtuchim, ⁽¹⁴⁾ and Pathrusim, and Casluchim,—out of whom went out Philistim,—and Caphtorim.

⁽¹⁵⁾ And Canaan begat Zidon his firstborn, and Heth, ⁽¹⁶⁾ and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgashite, ⁽¹⁷⁾ and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite, ⁽¹⁸⁾ and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hamathite: and afterwards the families of the Canaanite were spread-abroad. ⁽¹⁹⁾ And the border of the Canaanite was from Zidon, in thy going to Gerar, unto Gaza,—in thy going to Sodom, and Gomorrah, and Admah, and Zeboim, unto Lasha.

⁽²⁰⁾ These are the sons of Ham after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, in their nations.

⁽²¹⁾ And to Shem, to him also there was born,—the father of all the sons of Heber, the elder brother of Japheth.

⁽²²⁾ The sons of Shem, Elam, and Asshur, and Arphaxad, and Lud, and Aram.

⁽²³⁾ And the sons of Aram, Uz, and Hul, and Gether, and Mash.

⁽²⁴⁾ And Arphaxad begat Salah, and Salah begat (Heber) Eber. ⁽²⁵⁾ And to Eber were

born two sons,—the name of the one Peleg, for in his days the earth was divided (*palag*), and the name of his brother, Joktan. ⁽²⁶⁾ And Joktan begat Almodad, and Sheleph, and Hazarmaveth, and Jerah, ⁽²⁷⁾ and Hadoram, and Uzal, and Dikiah, ⁽²⁸⁾ and Obal, and Abimael, and Sheba, ⁽²⁹⁾ and Ophir, and Havilah, and Jobab: all these were the sons of Joktan. ⁽³⁰⁾ And their dwelling was from Mesha, is thy going to Sephar, the mountain of the East.

⁽³¹⁾ These are the sons of Shem, after their families, after their tongues, in their lands, after their nations.

⁽³²⁾ These are the families of the sons of Noah, after their generations, in their nations; and out of these were separated the nations in the earth after the Deluge.

11. ⁽¹⁾ And all the earth was of one (lip) language, and of one speech. ⁽²⁾ And it came to pass, in their journeying eastward, that they found a plain in the land of Shinar, and dwelt there. ⁽³⁾ And they said, (man) each to his comrade, 'Come-on, let us make bricks, and let us burn them (for a burning) thoroughly.' And the bricks were to them for stone, and the slime was to them for the mortar. ⁽⁴⁾ And they said, 'Come-on, let us build to us a city, and a tower (and) with its head in the heaven; and let us make to us a name, lest we be spread-abroad upon the face of all the earth.'

⁽⁵⁾ And JEHOVAH went down to see the city and the tower which the sons of man had built. ⁽⁶⁾ And JEHOVAH said, 'Behold! the people is one, and there is one (lip) language to all of them; and this is their beginning to do; and now there will not be restrained from them all which they have purposed to do. ⁽⁷⁾ Come-on, let us go down, and let us confound their (lip) language, that they may not know (man) each the (lip) language of his comrade.' ⁽⁸⁾ And JEHOVAH spread-abroad them from thence upon the face of all the earth, and they left-off to build the city. ⁽⁹⁾ Therefore (he called, i.e. one called=) men called its name Babel: for there JEHOVAH confounded (*bala*) the (lip) language of all the earth; and from thence JEHOVAH spread-abroad them upon the face of all the earth. ✕

CHAPTER VII.

GENERAL REMARKS ON THE RELATION OF SCRIPTURE AND SCIENCE.

969. HITHERTO, in the former Parts of this work, we have not considered any objection which has been raised to the historical truth of the story in the Pentateuch, on the ground of any miraculous or supernatural events recorded in it. We have simply treated the history as containing, or professing to contain, an authentic narrative of matters of fact. We have 'taken it and placed it,' as we have been so earnestly urged to do (*Quart. Review*, Oct. 1861, p. 368)—

in the crucible, and under the microscope of strict Inductive Logic:—

and we have found it full of unsuspected flaws, of 'difficulties, contradictions, improbabilities, impossibilities.'

970. But we have seen also that these phenomena have arisen in a great measure from the fact, that the Pentateuch is not, as the traditional view assumes, the work of one single writer, Moses,—describing transactions which fell in part within his own certain cognisance, and in many of which he himself was personally concerned,—but a composite work, the product of several different authors, who lived in different ages. We saw in Part III. that one large portion of this work, the Book of Deuteronomy, was mainly composed not earlier than the age of Josiah. We have now seen that the First Eleven Chapters of Genesis are manifestly due to two separate authors, distinct in tone and style, and writing from two very different points of view, and, on a mere literal principle of interpretation, in many particulars irreconcilable.

971. I believe that no one, who has followed the train of our previous reasoning, or even that of the seven preceding chapters, or who will give serious attention to the fact, which is laid bare before the eyes of English readers in the last two chapters, where the two documents are actually separated, will any longer doubt as to whether we are at liberty to criticise freely this portion of the Bible,—always, of course, reserving the respect which is due to the venerable character of these most ancient writings, and to the wonderful part which they have filled, in God's Providence, in the religious education of mankind, and with due consideration also of the feelings of many earnest and devout worshippers, by whom the Pentateuch, in all its parts, is still regarded as the actual work of Moses, and, in its every word and letter, is revered as the 'very foundation' of our faith, the very basis of our hopes for eternity,—the awful, infallible Word of the Living God.

972. Rather, it will be felt to be a positive duty, laid specially by our vocation upon us, the clergy of the

National Church, to face these great questions of our time, soberly and steadily, without fear, and without misgiving, as to what may be the ultimate consequences of pursuing such enquiries, under the guidance of His Spirit, who is the Spirit of Truth. If men say, 'Whither are you going?' we answer at once, 'We are going after Truth; and doing this in the right spirit—in the spirit of men who desire to know the Truth, that they may live more truly as becomes the children of God,—we are very sure that we are going towards God.'

973. As servants, then,—rather, as sons—of God, we desire to see what is really true, that we may know Him better, and serve Him better, than before. We cannot glorify God, we cannot make progress in the knowledge of God, by refusing to look at the facts, which He Himself is pleased to place before us in this our day, or by refusing to acknowledge them as facts, however they may contradict our previous notions. For facts, when God makes them plain to us, are solemn things, which we dare not disregard, to which we dare not shut our eyes, whether from indolence and the mere love of ease and quietness, or through fear of unreasoning clamour or of the censure and disapprobation of those, to whose judgments, in matters less sacred, we should naturally and properly defer.

'He, that is higher than the highest, regardeth it, and there be higher than they.'—Ecc.v.8.

974. We are now, then, free to consider the accounts of these miracles and supernatural appearances, which are recorded in the Pentateuch, and especially the stories of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, in the light of Modern Science,—not starting with the assumption, that such events as are here related are *à priori* in themselves impossible, but examining carefully the statements made, and comparing them—not only with each other, but—with what we *certainly* know to be true from other sources. For the Light of Modern Science, like any other 'good and perfect gift,' is a gift of God,—'is from above, and cometh down from the

Father of Lights.' It is His special gift to the present age. And 'in Him there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning.' His Revelation of Himself has been one and the same in all ages of the world,—differing, it is true, in degree, but the same essentially. As the writer just quoted (*Quart. Rev.*) has said, the Light of Revelation 'cannot be at variance' with the Light of Science. And 'whenever a difference arises,' we must see if it is not caused by 'some hypothesis, or assumption, or inference of man,' not by anything existing 'in the real Word, or the real Work, of the Creator.' Then 'we may preserve both peace and freedom.'

975. Surely, it must now be plain to most thoughtful readers, from the facts which we have had before us, that the cause of the differences in question *does* lie in a very false 'hypothesis, assumption, or inference of man,' as to what constitutes the 'real Word' of the Creator. It arises from the fact that men have been taught all along to regard the Bible in all its parts, and the Pentateuch especially, as a divinely infallible record of absolute historical truth. It arises from men insisting on the fallacy, that, if the Pentateuch be shown to be even partially unhistorical, then the whole history of the Jewish people will be left (*Quart. Rev.*)—

a dead and hollow shell of moral monstrosities, more incredible than the most capricious interferences with the world of matter,—

and coupling with it the still more shocking statement, that such monstrosities in the Jewish history—

would go far to disprove the very being of a God!

This is indeed, as we have said elsewhere, to bring the Sacred Ark itself into the Camp,—promoting superstition by fostering prejudice, instead of fighting the battle with the weapons of sincerity and truth.

976. While such language as the above is still employed, and the attempt is still made, by many from whom better things might have been expected, to urge upon the people the reception of all the Pentateuchal narratives as actual statements of real historical fact, there

is no alternative left to us but to show that such a view is utterly untenable, in the light of common sense, and consistently with what we know of the Divine Attributes. We must do this, in defence of the Truth itself, and for the protection of those, especially in the rising generation, who may thus be misled to believe that Religion itself demands at their hands the sacrifice of their reasoning powers,—that God can only be devoutly and faithfully served, by renouncing at once all right of free enquiry into these questions of Biblical Criticism, and all thought of reconciling the teachings of Religion with the results of Modern Science, and the great discoveries of the age.

977. Who would otherwise wish to be employed in dissecting these grand old stories, and pointing out their inconsistencies or their defects in scientific accuracy? As TUCH observes, *Gen.p.2*:

Who would deny the worth of these documents, because the authors knew nothing of the system of Copernicus, or of Kepler's Law-book of the Heavens? Or who will now any longer make the attempt to bring these old theories into unison with the results of scientific investigations of Nature?

And VON BOHLEN observes, (HEYWOOD'S Eng. Ed.), ii.p.4 :—

Verily, he who restricts himself to the letter of this cosmogony [in G.], and applies to it HERSHEY'S discoveries, . . . to such a man not only is all sense for poetry and antiquity closed, but also, to speak plainly, all feeling for the pious and elevating object of the writer. But still more is there an absence of poetical and classical taste in him, who derives each step of the narrative through inspiration from the Deity, in order that this cosmogony may far exceed everything that we know from the wise men of the ancient [or the modern] world.

978. Yet the attempt is still made, which TUCH, writing twenty-five years ago, deemed impossible even in that stage of advancing Science. There are still to be found those, high in ecclesiastical position and influence, who think it necessary to maintain that 'Scripture and Science' are not in any single point 'at variance,'—that the veracity of the Divine Being Himself is pledged for the infallible truth of each one of these ancient narratives,—that every story in the Pentateuch is, at all events, *substantially* true, as a

piece of authentic, historical matter-of-fact, and that 'all our nearest and dearest consolations will be taken from us' if we cease to believe this.

979. As KALISCH writes, *Gen.p.12*:

It was, and—incredible to say—is still (1853) asserted, that the fossils have never been animated structures, but were formed in the rocks through the planetary influences,—that the mammoth, which at the conclusion of the last century was found in the ice of the polar regions in such remarkable preservation that dogs and bears fed upon its flesh, had never been a living creature, but was created under the ice, and then preserved, instead of being transmuted into stone,—that all organisms found in the depth of the earth are models, created in the first day, to typify the living plants and animals to be produced in the subsequent part of the creative week; but, inasmuch as many forms, which lie buried in the earth, do not exist on the earth, these latter were rejected, as inappropriate or imperfect,—they represent the 'gates of death,' but foreshadow also the immortality of the soul, the resurrection, and the ultimate reunion of the dust of the human bodies at the sound of the last trumpet! See 'A Brief and Complete Refutation of the Anti-Scriptural Theory of Geologists,' by 'A Clergyman of the Church of England.'

Most justly does KALISCH observe, with reference to such assertions, p.18:—

The Bible has no more dangerous enemies than those, who, either from indolence or apathy, are deaf to the teaching and warning of the other sciences; and those men, however well-meaning and warm-hearted, must be made mainly answerable, if the authority of the Scriptures should be disregarded by the most enlightened and most comprehensive minds.

980. But while such assertions are made, either of the scientific accuracy, or of the infallible historical truth, of the Hebrew Scriptures,—assertions which the Church of England, at all events, has never made in any of her formularies,—it is necessary in defence of Religion itself to show, as plainly as possible, their utter groundlessness, that so the progress of scientific enquiry may not again be checked, as it was in days not very long gone by, by the blind irreverence of mere superstition. Let it be once freely admitted that these stories of the first chapters of Genesis, whatever they may teach of Divine Eternal Truth, and whatever precious lessons may be drawn from them by a devout mind, are in their present form and structure mythical descriptions, where the narrative is an

imaginative clothing for ideas, and so are not to be regarded as teaching unquestionable matters of historical fact, which occurred in the primitive times; and then such a comparison, as we must now make, between the statements of the Bible and well-known facts of Science, would be superfluous and uncalled-for.

981. In the following chapters we shall consider at length the accounts of the Creation, Fall, Deluge, &c., as given in G.i.1-xi.26, in the light of Modern Science. We may here, however, introduce a few remarks upon the first of these subjects from a very candid writer, the Rev. Dr. RORISON, in *Replies to Essays and Reviews*, p.329-338, for the orthodoxy of which, we presume, the Bishop of OXFORD, the avowed editor of the volume in question, must be held responsible:—

By what epithet shall we designate the Mosaic heptameron? Sceptics call it a *myth*, or else, more mildly, the *speculation of an ancient sage*. Most Christians speak of it as a *history or narrative*. The author of an able and learned 'Reply' to 'Essays and Reviews,' written in a most reverential spirit, has come to the conclusion that it is a *parable*. Others suggest that it is a *vision*. One gentleman considers it as an account of *plan*, as distinguished from *fulfilment*. We venture to think none of these descriptions satisfactory. The Book of Genesis opens with the inspired *Psalms of Creation*.

On the hypothesis that we have to do with an ordinary prose narrative, chronicle, or diary, there immediately emerges the great difficulty of the 'days.' With this it is not too much to say that no ingenuity has as yet grappled successfully. The choice lies between the Chalmersian interpolation of the geological ages before the first day begins, and the Cuvierian expansion of the six days into geological ages. For these solutions, respectively, Dr. BUCKLAND and HUGH MILLER have done their best. But the arguments, which compelled HUGH MILLER to abandon the older method, have not been answered. Nor is his own scheme free from the gravest difficulties. Who can bring himself to believe, for example, that, when the sacred writer speaks of trees laden for human use with seed-enclosing fruit, he could have had in his mind, or could have so described, the gymnogonous flora of the coal-measures?

Certain writers evade embarrassment by declining to elect among the competing 'reconciliations.' It is enough, they suggest, that some one of them *may* be sound, although it is inconvenient to become responsible for any one of them; or they allege that the record was not intended to do what it expressly undertakes and professes to do; or, otherwise, that the time is not come for a

comparison between Scripture and Geology, since there are points on which geologists are not agreed among themselves. This multi-form fallacy of evasion is exemplified by BUCKLAND, p.12,33, Archd. PRATT, p.33, &c. Dr. CHALMERS himself, in his private correspondence, betrays a similar hesitancy, by speaking of 'yet another way of *saving the credit of the record*.' It, no doubt, escaped this great and good man that his own 'way' brought him into direct collision with the 'Shorter Catechism,' which asserts that God's work of Creation consists in 'His making all things out of nothing' *in the space of six days*,—not millions of years before the *first day* dawned.

All this is but a manifestation of anxiety to snatch a cherished dogma from a dreaded foe. Were the panic well-founded, the belief indebted to such expedients would be only screened not saved. . . . The worst disservice to the cause of Truth is that contributed by contorted Science and sophistic exegesis,—e.g. 'Before sin entered, there could be no violent death, if any death at all. But, by the particular structure of the teeth of animals, God prepared them for that kind of aliment, which they were to subsist on after the Fall!'—ADAM CLARKE on G.i.

Enough whether of quibbles or of make-shifts! When we consider the pervading parallelism,—the rhythmic refrain, 'the evening and the morning,'—the periodic fiat, 'Let there be light, a water-parting firmament, Land, Plants,—Lights in the Firmament, Life in the Waters, Life on the Land, Man,—the punctual fulfilment, 'It was so,'—the retrospect, 'God saw that it was good,'—the chief wonder is how it ever was possible to exact from the oldest and sublimest poem in the world the attributes of narrative prose.

982. Then, after stating the 'structure of the Mosaic heptameron,' which may, perhaps, be given more distinctly thus:—

First Day, Light, corresponds to *Fourth Day*, Luminaries.

Second Day, Water and Heaven, corresponds to *Fifth Day*, Fish and Fowl.

Third Day, Land and Vegetation, corresponds to *Sixth Day*, Animals and Man, who are to inhabit the land, and feed on the vegetation.

Seventh Day—Rest—

Dr. RORISON adds, with reference to his own solution:—

He, who perceives this, has the true key to the concord, which he will search for elsewhere and otherwise in vain. Respect the parallelism, cease to ignore the structure, allow for the mystic significance of the number seven, and all perplexities vanish. . . . Thus the 'days' themselves are transfigured from registers of time into definitions of strophes or stanzas,—lamps and landmarks of a creative sequence,—a mystic drapery, a parabolic setting, shadowing, by the sacred cycle of seven, the truths of an *ordered progress*, a *foreknown finality*, an *achieved perfection*, and a *divine repose*.

983. Bishop WILBERFORCE has also lent the sanction of his name to the publication of the following passage in the same work (*Replies to Essays and Reviews*, p.514) from the pen of the Rev. R. MAIN, M.A., Radcliffe Observer in the University of OXFORD, which *directly denies* the 'literal historical truth' of this portion of the Pentateuch:—

Some school-books still teach to the ignorant that the earth is 6,000 years old, and that all things were created in six days. No well-educated person of the present day shares in the delusion. We know that we cannot expand our ideas of God's universe too much, both as to space and time. With Him a thousand years are but as one day; and, if we take a thousand years as the unit of our counting, we shall require still an incalculable number of such units, to enumerate the sum of Creation-periods. Whatever be the meaning of the six days, ending with the seventh day's mystical and symbolical rest, *indisputably we cannot accept them in their literal meaning.* They serve, apparently, as the divisions of the record of Creation, lest the mind may be too much burdened and perplexed by all these wonderful acts: but *they as plainly do not denote the order of succession of all the individual creations.* Something is symbolised, and the author of the Ep. to the Hebrews uses the symbol; and this, the only mystical fact in the whole narrative (?), we may surely, in all reverence, leave unexplained, without detracting at all from the credit or the veracity of this wonderful record.

CHAPTER VIII.

GEN.I.1-II.3.

984. G.i.1—

In the beginning ELOHIM created the Heaven and the Earth.

The plain meaning of this verse,—as it would be understood by any simple-minded reader, who had not yet perceived the difficulties of the case, and been taught to 'reconcile' them,—is undoubtedly this, that, 'in the beginning,' at the commencement of the present state of things, as the first act of that continuous six days' work, of which man was to be the last, 'God created the Heaven and the Earth,' *i.e.* the Universe, the Hebrews having no single word by which to express this idea. The same Hebrew word is used for 'create' in v.1 as is used in v.21, 'God created great whales,' and in v.27, 'So God created man in his own image.'

And, in E.xx.11, it is expressly said that—

'in six days Jehovah made the Heaven and the Earth, the Sea, and all that in them is.'

985. Here, however, in E.xx.11, the word used is 'made.' And Archd. PRATT (*Scripture and Science not at Variance*, p.38) attempts to argue that G.i.1, where 'create' (*bara*) is used, relates to an original calling out of nothing the material, out of which the things now existing were afterwards 'made:' so that immense ages and numerous revolutions of the Universe may have taken place, in strict agreement with the statements of this chapter, before the formation of the world as it now is, and the constitution of the present order of things,—*i.e.* between v.1 and v.3.

986. Accordingly, he says that the word in E.xx.11 is not used in the sense of 'create,' but—

in the sense of *did, appointed, constituted, set for a particular purpose or use*; and never once, in the hundred and fifty places, where it occurs in the Book of Genesis, is it used in the sense of 'created.'

So again he writes, p.32:—

In Genesis we read, 'In the beginning God created the Heaven and the Earth.' In the following verses the work of the six days is described, in which God prepared the Earth, and the sea, and the clouds, and the atmosphere (or heaven), for man's appearance upon earth.

It is this six days' work which is alluded to in the Fourth Commandment, and not the original Creation of matter. . . . The word *hasah*, made, which occurs 154 times in Genesis, is not once rendered (!) 'created.' . . . This word occurs about 2,700 times in the O.T., and, I believe, is not once translated (!) 'created.'

987. But what matters it whether, or not, our 'translators' have 'rendered' this word by 'created,' when it plainly means 'created' in numberless passages? *E.g.*:—

'And ELOHIM made the animal of the earth after its kind,' i.25;

'Let us make man in our image,' i.26;

'The serpent was more subtle than any animal of the field, which JEHOVAH-ELOHIM had made,' iii.1;

'It repented JEHOVAH that He had made man upon the earth,' vi.6.

Compare, also,—

In the image of ELOHIM created He him,' i.27;

In the image of ELOHIM made He him,' ix.6—

where the two words are manifestly used as synonymous.

988. It appears, then,—especially from E.xx.11,—that there is absolutely no room for the supposition, to which CHALMERS gave popularity, that G.i.1 refers to a great primeval act, which may have been separated by vast geological ages from the creative acts described in the rest of the chapter, and v.2, as Archd. PRATT writes, p. 31, to— a state of emptiness and waste, into which the earth long after fell, ere God prepared it as the residence of the most perfect of his creatures,—

a view this which, however adapted to the state of geological science at the time when it was proposed, has, with the advance of that science, turned into a 'broken reed,' piercing, like so many previous attempts to reconcile Scripture Poetry with Natural Science, the 'hands that leant upon it.'

989. For v.2 is evidently in continuation with v.1, and describes the state of the 'Earth' named in v.1, when first created. And reference is made to this creation of the Earth and the Heaven, at the same time when all other things were created, in ii.4—

'These are the generations of the Heaven and of the Earth in their creation, in the day of JEHOVAH-ELOHIM'S making Earth and Heaven.'

Thus we are plainly taught in the Book of Genesis, according to the simple, straightforward meaning of the words, that Elohim created the Heaven and the Earth 'in the beginning' of these *six days*,—that is, taking into account the chronological data of the Bible, about *six thousand years ago*.

But Geology teaches that the earth has been in existence for hundreds of thousands—perhaps millions—of years.

990. Again, we are told in this chapter of Genesis that the different races of living creatures, plants, &c., were created in *six days*. And these cannot be explained to denote *six geological ages*, as some have suggested; they are, in the meaning of the writer, six common days of twenty-four hours. This appears both from the statements in the chapter itself, noticed below, and from E.xx.11, where we are told that God worked for six days, and

rested 'on the seventh day,' which, therefore, He sanctified as the Sabbath. Consequently, since in the mind of the writer of this passage the seventh day was a common day, so also must the other six days have been common days. And so says Archd. PRATT, *Scripture and Science*, &c., p.45:—

There is one class of interpreters with whom I cannot agree,—I mean those who take the six days to be six periods of indefinite length. . . . Is it not a harsh and forced interpretation, to suppose that, in E.xx, the 'six days' in v.9 do not mean the same as the 'six days' in v.11, but that in this last place they mean 'six periods'? In reading through v.11, it is extremely difficult to believe that the 'seventh day' is a long period, and the 'Sabbath Day' an ordinary day, that is, that the same word 'day' should be used in two totally different senses in the same short sentence, and without any explanation.

991. In fact, we may ask, can the *fourth*, *fifth*, and *sixth* days have been supposed by the writer to be 'indefinite periods,' when the two great lights had been already set in the firmament, to give light upon the earth, and to rule over the day and over the night, and to *divide the light from the darkness*? If, in fact, we were to take for the first three days the word 'day' to mean an indefinite creation-period, yet then the same word would be used in two passages directly following each other,—even in two consecutive *verses*, v.13,14,—in two totally different senses, without the least intimation being given that from the fourth day onwards it must be understood in a different sense from before, that is, in the sense of an ordinary day (!). Well may Mr. BURTON say, *Inspiration*, &c., p.38:—

Such an interpretation seems to stultify the whole narrative. A *week* is described. *Days* are spoken of, each made up of an *evening* and a *morning*. God's cessation from the work of creation on the seventh day is emphatically adduced as the reason of the Fourth Commandment,—the mysterious precedent for our observance of one day of rest at the end of every six days of toil,—'for in six days (it is declared) the Lord made Heaven and Earth.' You may not play tricks with language plain as this, and elongate a week until it shall more than embrace the span of all recorded time.

992. We conclude, then, that the first chapter of Genesis, understood in its plain grammatical sense, does mean to say that, in six ordinary days, Almighty God—

'Made the Heaven and the Earth, the Sea, and all that in them is.'

But Geology shows that the Earth was not brought into its present form in six days, but by continual changes through a long succession of ages, during which enormous periods innumerable varieties of animal and vegetable life have abounded upon it, from a time beyond all power of calculation.

993. Further, the account in Genesis represents the order of Creation to have been—first, *Plants*, v.12, next, *Fish and Fowl*, v.21, then *Cattle and Reptiles*, v.25, and, lastly, *Man*, v.27.

But Geological observation shows that, in different ages, plants and animals of all kinds appeared together at the same time upon the earth, so that they were not *successively* created, as the Bible says,—first, all the *Plants*, then all the *Fish*, &c.

994. G.i.2.

'And the Earth was desolation and emptiness, and darkness was upon the face of the deep.'

Here the Scripture represents the earth as 'without form and void,' desolation and emptiness, in a state of utter chaos and confusion,—*rudis indigestaque moles*,—and wrapt in darkness,—immediately before the races of plants and animals, now existing on its surface, were created.

But Geology proves that no such a state of things immediately preceded the epoch fixed in the Bible for the Creation of Man,—that, in point of fact, the face of the Earth has existed generally just as now, with the same kinds of animal and vegetable life as now, long before the six thousand years implied in the Bible story, and that no sudden convulsion took place at that time, by which they might have been all destroyed, so as to give occasion for a new Creation. As HUGH MILLER observes, *Test. of the Rocks*, p.121:—

For many ages ere man was ushered into being, not a few of his humble contemporaries of the fields and woods enjoyed life in their present haunts, and for thousands of years, anterior even to their appearance, many of the existing mollusks lived in our seas.

995. G.i.5.

'And it was evening and it was morning—one day.'

The appearance of the 'light' was, perhaps, considered as the first *morning*, and the antecedent 'darkness' as the first *evening*. This, at least, is the explanation commonly given. But the natural order of the account of the first day would be to mention the *morning*, i.e. the appearance of the light out of darkness, *before the evening*. The phenomena here observed, however, taken in connection with other ancient religious traditions, may, perhaps, throw light on the origin of the account itself.

996. The Hebrews, Greeks, Persians, Gauls, Germans, &c. began the day in civil matters with the *evening*; hence the expression for a *full day*, viz.: 'evening-morning,' Dan.viii.14; *comp.* se'nnight (seven-night), fortnight (fourteen-night). The Hindoos and later Babylonians reckoned from *sunrise*, the Umbrians from *noon*, the Roman priests from *midnight*.

997. G.i.7.

'And ELOHIM made the expanse, and divided the waters which were beneath the expanse from the waters which were above the expanse.'

The Hebrews regarded the sky as a spread-out surface, or expanse, from which the *upper* waters were supposed to be dropped in rain upon the earth, and by which they were altogether separated from the *lower* streams and seas upon the earth's surface.

According to the mythical representation, this heavenly vault is provided with a door, G.xxviii.17; it rests upon pillars and foundations, Job xxvi.11, 28.xxii.8; and its glistening blue makes it appear as a crystal sapphire-like mass, E.xxiv.10, Dan.xii.3, or like a 'molten looking-glass,' Job xxxvii.18. Above this vault rolls the heavenly ocean, the 'waters above the heavens,' Ps.cxlvi.4, wherein Jehovah has set His throne, Ps.xxix.3,10. Through the 'doors,' Ps.lxxviii.23, and 'windows,' G.vii.11, 2K.vii.2,19, in the Firmament, this ocean pours down upon the earth as rain.

Yet we ought not to confound these mythical representations, which later poets gladly retained, with the science proper of the Hebrews; for already we read in Job xxvi.7, 'He stretcheth out the Heaven over emptiness, He hangeth the Earth upon nothing'; and in G.ii.6, Job xxxvi.27, we find a more correct view of the origin of rain. . . The idea of a heavenly ocean above the Firmament is found also in the Indian Mythology, *Samaveda*, BOPP. p.301, 'Water is above the Heaven, which the Heaven sustains.' TUCH, *Gen.* p.21.

998. DELITZSCH admits a 'defect' in

the statement made in the text before us, p. 108:—

According to this view of the narrative, the masses of water floating in the air, and coming down as rain, belong not to the earthly, but to the heavenly waters. It must be allowed that the O.T. view is herein chargeable with a defect, since no physical connection exists between the waters which descend in rain, and the heavenly waters, to which the N.T. also refers: *comp.* 'sea as of glass,' Rev. iv. 6, xv. 2, 'river of water of life,' xxii. 1. This view, however, is not without deep truth. The rain is, as it were, a dole of the heavenly waters let down, and a heavenward-pointing type of it. . . Besides which, it is worthy of consideration that the exactest astronomical enquiry teaches us that there are white spots upon the poles of Mars, (!) which exhibit just the same appearances as our snow-and-ice-covered polar regions,—that the matter, of which Jupiter is composed, is not more dense, and on the surface is even less dense, than our water,—that the matter of Saturn is not half as dense as water, a little less dense, therefore, than fir-wood, &c. Such teachings of the latest astronomy are of use to familiarise us with the thought, that the upper waters denote a really supra-fermental fluid or something like water, whatever it may be,—perhaps the substance out of which, on the fourth day, the Stars were actually formed, as the dry-land out of the 'lower waters.'

999. Such are the resources to which men of great ability are driven, in defence of the traditional view. They sacrifice the majestic poetry of the ancient narrative, its sublime embodiment of the impressions made on our senses by the objects of created nature, in order to extort from it a pretended Revelation of what we have already learnt by scientific research. Can we any longer doubt that the Scripture writer had neither the 'sea' and 'river' of the Revelations, nor the stellar matter, in his view, but simply expresses the very natural conception of his time, that there were stores of rain in the upper regions of the sky, from which water was let down, whenever the 'windows of heaven' were opened?

1000. Dr. THOMAS BURNET writes as follows, *Arch. Phil.* p. 309:—

The matter stands thus. The vulgar do not understand the natural production of rain through condensed vapours, but believe that rain is sent through Divine influence from heaven, or immediately by God. That Moses might fall in with this opinion, he placed a common receptacle of the waters above the skies, that God, at His pleasure, by opening or closing the barriers, might send or hold back the rain. This appears to me to have

been the mind and meaning of the sacred writer, as regards the supercelestial waters. And in this way we consult best for the dignity of Moses, if, as often as there is a departure from scientific truth, we suppose this to be done, by accommodating his account of the Creation of the world to the powers and habits of thought of the people.

So, when mention is made of the primary Light, on the first day of the Creation, that phenomenon is equally inexplicable on physical grounds. But, in order that God might not seem to be working in the dark for three days, it seemed expedient to Moses, to produce the light at the very beginning of the work. But what kind of light? Light without origin, without source. Light, however, if we philosophise, proceeds from a centre of some kind. . . Besides, according to the letter of Scripture, God seems to have intermitted His work in the night-time, as men are wont to do. Yet I see not how the other hemisphere, celestial or terrestrial, could have been made, if there was any intermission of labour, if God did not act except where there was light. But the vulgar cares not for these niceties, nor dreams of antipodes or another hemisphere, but conceives of the universe as a tent, of which heaven is the upper part, and the plane surface of the earth, the base.

1001. G.i.9.

'And ELOHIM said, Let the waters under the Heaven be gathered to one place, and let the dry-land appear.'

KALISCH observes, *Gen.* p. 69:—

The formation of the continents, as described in our text, agrees but very remotely with that made probable by geological researches. For, whilst the latter teach us that the same part of the globe was many times alternately water and dry-land, and that volcanic eruptions were one of the chief agencies of these changes, our text declares that, at the beginning of time, the Will of God made, once for all, the permanent division between seas and continents; there was no upheaving of the land, but only a concentration of the floods to certain parts. This does not explain the formation of the strata, nor of the fossil remains of vegetables and animals—which, according to the Bible, did not yet exist—in the interior of the earth, nor any of the wonders, which make Geology one of the most interesting and absorbing sciences. But we have willingly renounced the attempt to discover that harmony.

1002. G.i.16.

'And ELOHIM made two great lights, the greater light for the rule of the day, and the lesser light for the rule of the night.'

It is a mere evasion of the plain meaning of these words, to say that Elohim made the Sun and Moon to appear first only on the fourth day, though they had been long before created,—*appear*, that is, to the Earth, when, however, according to the story, there were as yet no living creatures on

its face to see them. The writer manifestly intends to teach that Elohim actually made the Sun and Moon at this time. And, in fact, he uses here the very same Hebrew word as he had used before in *v. 7*, 'Elohim made the firmament,' and as he uses again in *v. 25*, 'Elohim made the animal of the earth after its kind.'

1003. Thus WILLEST writes in 1605, before attempts were made to force the Scripture into agreement with the results of Science, *Her. in Gen. p. 10*:—

These Lights were neither made the first day, and but placed now in the firmament, as the Hebrewes think,—neither was the Sunne made the first day, the Moone the next, the Starres the third, as Eugubinus,—but they were all made upon the fourth day. . . . That these two great lights are the Sunne and Moone, there is no question; and that the Sunne is the greatest of all the celestial bodies, it is also questionlesse. ANAXAGORAS did hold the Sunne much greater than Peloponnesus, a country in Grecia,—ANAXIMANDER, to be as big as the Earth; but, since, the Mathematicians have found that the Sunne exceedeth the Earth in bignes 166 times,* and none of the other Starres, which they call of the first magnitude, whereof there are 115, to exceede the Earth above 18 times. The Moone,—though some among the heathen have judged it bigger than the Earth, as the Stoikes, and equall to the Sunne, as PARMENIDES, and some among the Christians have thought it in bignes next to the Sunne, because it is here named to be a great light, as BASIL upon this place, and AUGUSTINE,—yet, since, by more diligent search, it is found to be lesse than the Earth 39 times, and to be the least of all the Starres, except Mercury. Moses, therefore, here speaketh according to the opinion and capacite of the vulgar sort, to whose sight the Moone seemeth greatest, next to the Sunne, because it is nearest of all the starres to the Earth, and for that it is greatest in operation, and hath the government of the night. The reason of the greatnes of these lights is their farre distance from the earth. EMPEDOCLES saith, the Moone is twice so far from the Sunne as it is from the Earth: but the Mathematicians say it is 18 times so far from the Sunne.

1004. But Geology teaches that, for

* Taking the Sun's diameter as 880,000 miles, and the Earth's as 8,000, it will follow that bulk of Sun : bulk of Earth :: 110^2 : 1 : 1,331,000 : 1. We can form some conception of this enormous bulk, by supposing the Sun placed so that its centre shall be coincident with the Earth's centre: then (since its radius is 440,000 miles) its huge body would stretch out in all directions nearly as far beyond the Moon, as the Moon itself is distant from the Earth (240,000 miles). We can thus gain some idea of the enormous magnitude of the 'greater Light,' the lord of the Solar System.

countless ages before Man lived upon the Earth, the Sun, beyond all doubt, was the centre and source of light and heat to the Earth, and to its living creatures of all kinds, whose eyes were formed, just exactly as they are now, to receive its rays,—as well as to the successive generations of plants, which grew in those primeval forests, to which are due the carboniferous formations.

1005. Dr. M'CAUL, however, writes, *Aids to Faith, p. 218*:—

Moses represents the Earth as existing for a long period before the Sun became its source of light and heat. During that period there could have been no climatic difference, as this depends upon the position of the Earth with regard to the Sun. Now, this exactly agrees with the conclusions of Geology, which asserts that, before the human period, there was no difference of climate, that the Earth was not dependent on the Sun for its temperature (!); that there was apparently one uniform high temperature over the whole Earth, and, consequently, that the Flora and Fauna of warm climates are found, in the prehuman period, in latitudes where they would not now exist. Here, then, is an instance of the extraordinary scientific accuracy of the Mosaic account.

1006. On the contrary, scientific geologists maintain that, though there was, probably, a time when the temperature of the earth was more uniform than it is now, yet that this was not the case for long ages before the human period began; and, further, that, at all times, the earth, with its vegetable products and living creatures of all kinds, has been to all appearance dependent upon the Sun for light and heat, just exactly as now. And Sir CHARLES LYELL has shown how, without any violent convulsion or sudden catastrophe,—by the steady silent operation of natural forces now in action, modifying gradually the extent of land and water, and slowly elevating, or depressing, the former during a long lapse of years,—a tolerably uniform temperature might be diffused over the whole or large portions of the globe, whether the warmth of the thermal or the cold of the glacial period.

1007. G. i. 16.

'And the stars.'

It is plain that the writer of this chapter had very little notion of the real magnitude of the heavenly bodies, and so he assigns one day only for the

formation of the Sun, Moon, and Stars, while three or four are spent upon the Earth alone. He looked upon the Sun as being,—what it appears to our senses to be, and what, before the time of Copernicus, it was almost universally supposed to be,—a mere appendage to the Earth, which he regarded as the scene of all God's wonderful operations, the centre of the universe, for whose service only and convenience the 'host of heaven' was created,—

'The Sun for the rule of the day, and the Moon for the rule of the night.'

1008. And the Stars, those points of light, he regarded, no doubt, as a small addition to the greater luminaries, without having the least idea that each one of their glorious host,—which Astronomy now shows to be infinitely more numerous than he could have supposed,—was itself a mighty Sun, though placed at an immense distance from us,* in comparison with whose bulk that of our earth would shrink into nothing. Indeed, how little the Jews had really observed the Stars, appears from the circumstance that there is no allusion in the Old Testament to the distinction between *fixed* and *wandering* stars, which MILTON supposes Adam to have remarked before he had been upon the Earth forty-eight hours,—

* It is difficult to realise to ourselves the enormous size and distance from us of the Fixed Stars, and the awful solitude in which each separate Star, and its little troop of Planets, exists by itself, in the midst of the mighty universe. Perhaps the following calculation may assist the reader's mind to grasp more distinctly the reality of these facts, and appreciate more fully the grandeur of the heavenly host :—

One travelling at railway-speed, day and night, 34 miles an hour, or 100 miles in 3 hours, would reach the Moon in 300 days; and at the same rate, he would reach the Sun in 330 years. But, if he could reach the Sun in one single day, it would take 550 years of such travelling to reach the nearest Fixed Star. And then, it must be remembered, for all that enormous interval, on every side of our Sun and its little family, there is, as far as we know, an *awful void*, as far as regards any possibility of the existence of animal life! And the same tremendous vacancy, as far as the possibility of animal existence is concerned, most probably extends between one Star and another, and on all sides around each separate Star,—nay, around each separate mote of nebular star-dust.

And ye five other wandering Stars, that move
In mystic dance, not without song.

Paradise Lost, v. 77-8.

1009. G. i. 21.

'And every fowl of wing after its kind.'

It is plain that under the terms 'fowl,' in this verse, and 'creeping-things,' v. 25, the writer must be supposed to include, not only birds and reptiles, but all flying and creeping things whatsoever, worms, insects, &c., and even animalcules. Otherwise, no provision is made for the existence of these things. And so we read, L. xi. 20,—

'All fowls that creep, going upon all four, shall be an abomination to you';

and then the 'locust,' in four different stages of its growth, is excepted. So among unclean 'creeping-things' are numbered the 'mouse, tortoise, lizard, snail, mole, &c.' L. xi. 29, 30.

1010. It is probable that the author supposed only *one* pair of each kind of animal created originally, as he supposes only one pair of human beings, and makes Noah also take only one pair of each kind of creature into the Ark, for the continuation of the species after the Deluge. DELITZSCH, however, maintaining as far as he can the traditional view, writes as follows, p. 116 :—

That these animals, created on the sixth day, sprang from one common centre of creation, the record says not, and just as little, that every kind has begun from a single pair, and spread itself out from thence, as it increased, over its present region. The older natural philosophers, as LINNÆUS, and also later ones, bring forward, not uninfluenced to some extent by the Scripture record, this view, which is not in any sense favoured by it. What the Biblical record says of man, must not be transferred to the animal world. That all kinds of animals, of all zones and climates, have made their way across over all hindrances to their present habitats, and that, for instance, only two ants and bees, buffaloes and antelopes, were created,—these are fancies which anyone may produce if he likes, but must not consider as articles of faith, under which the Holy Scripture takes him captive. There is all the difference in the world between the unity of the human race, which Scripture does not call a 'kind,' and the unity of a so-called 'kind' or 'species' of animal. The unity of these latter exists, if it begins at once with many specimens. If, then, Natural Science must assume that animals, now spread over a wide extent of country and separated by vast regions, must have proceeded at once from several centres of

Creation, this agrees with the Scriptural view. And if also it is established, that the animals are not uniformly spread over the whole surface of the region which they occupy,—that they are most numerous in the mid-region, but at the borders are fewer in number, and at last disappear altogether, and make room for others,—so also does the single glance which we have taken, into the work-place and operations of that divine fiat, which passed upon the fifth and sixth days, assure us of the same.

Ans. The difficulty, which DELITZSCH here avoids, comes upon us again in the account of the Deluge, where the Elohist says that one pair only of each kind of animal was saved, and though the Jehovist excepts seven pairs of clean animals, yet both agree that only one pair of each kind of *unclean* creatures was preserved in the Ark; and all these are supposed to have spread out after the Flood from one centre to their present localities. Of course, refuge may be taken in the notion of a *partial* Deluge, which question will be discussed in the proper place. But, we may ask at once, what reason could there have been for taking a pair of ants or bees into the Ark,—because these creatures lived in the partial centre around Ararat, supposed to be flooded,—if they existed freely in other countries, beyond the boundaries of the inundation?

1011. G.i.22.

'And Elohim blessed them, saying, Be fruitful, and multiply, and fill the waters in the seas, and let fowl multiply in the earth.'

DELITZSCH is here harassed by another difficulty, and endeavours to struggle out of it as follows, p.117:—

Had the animals, which are found buried in the mountains, any share in this blessing? CHATEAUBRAND and other modern writers say, 'No: they cannot have been intended to propagate.' But it is not possible to reconcile with the Scripture record the notion of a creation of animals preceding the fifth day. . . . Also, neither in the Scripture text, nor in the old-world discoveries, lies there any necessity to suppose a whole series of older creations of animals antecedently to the fifth day, with which the creation of animals begins. . . . If the Creation-days, as we are persuaded, not merely for scientific reasons,—[=we have managed to force the Scripture into some appearance of agreement with the certain results of Science,]—are Creation-periods of Divine proportions, then is there more room allowed, for the process of formation of the Earth's surface, from before the third day until the Creation of Man; and nothing prevents our assuming that this process of formation was attended with catastrophes, which burst through the creation of animals in the fifth and sixth days, and swallowed up whole generations of them,—[except the simple fact that, as it advances, geological science obstinately refuses to admit the possibility of any such catastrophes having occurred.]

We shall find DELITZSCH stating his views on this point more fully below.

1012. G.i.26.

'And Elohim said, Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.'

As DELITZSCH observes, p.120:—

The Creation of Man, which the writer has now next to relate, has such an attraction for him, that he hastens over the blessings of the land-animals, without particularly mentioning it, [whereas he has mentioned the blessing on the fishes and birds, v.22.]

1013. With respect to the plural forms here used, it is well-known that in former days great stress was laid on these, as proofs of the doctrine of the Trinity, contained in the very first chapter of Genesis. Thus PASCHASIS, *de Spir. Sanct.*, i.5, says:—

Perceive how thrice the name of God is pronounced in the creation of man. For thus we have in Genesis, 'And God said, Let us make man,' and again, 'God created man,' and a third time, 'God blessed them.' God said, God made, God blessed: on account of the Three Persons is the One Divinity thrice repeated. In which passage understand evidently the mystery of the Trinity. . . . Therefore, in the fact that He says, 'Let us make man after our image,' the number of Persons is unfolded.

And HILARY writes, *Genesis* 110-2:—

'Let us make man,' Thou sayst. Tell me, Thou Best,
With whom Thou now art speaking? It is plain:
E'en then, on the high Throne, the Son sits by Thee,
And views the pleasant lands.

1014. DELITZSCH, however, rejects justly this interpretation, and explains the words as implying that the Divine Being communicated His purpose to the angel-hosts surrounding him, p.121:—

PHILO, who explains the passage thus, 'The Father of all discourses to his own Powers,' i.556, understands by 'Powers' the angels, and takes the words, therefore, as 'communicating,' for which view we decide. . . . When also in the Babylonian myth the 'other gods' take part in the production of men,—when in the Persian the Amschaspands (celestial beings) appear as demiurgic Powers, and Ormuzd is associated with the divine spirits,—when OVID, *Met.* i.83, says that Man is formed 'after the image of the gods who govern all things,'—these are all echoes of this 'Let us make,' which throw a certain light on its true meaning.

1015. The above explanation, confirmed, as it seems to be, by the occurrence of similar expressions in the other oriental creation-stories, may be the true one. But the view of KALISCH, *Gen.* p.80, seems best, viz. that we have here only—

the plural usually, though not necessarily, employed in deliberations and self-exhortations: *comp.* xi. 7, 'Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language,' with ii. 18, 'I will make him an help meet for him': [see, however, iii. 22, 'The man has become as one of us, to know good and evil'; but here also the expression may be merely one in popular use; at any rate, there cannot *here* be any reference to the Trinity.]

We have seen (II. 326) that the plural form, 'Elohim,' has no connection whatever with the doctrine of the Trinity, being used of Dagon, 1 S. v. 7, Astarte, 1 K. xi. 5, Baalzebub, 2 K. i. 2, 3, 6, as well as of the True God.

1016. G. i. 27.

'In the image of Elohim created He him.'

This idea occurs also in other ancient writers generally. According to LUCIAN, *Pro Imag.* 28, Man was named by the best philosophers, 'the image of God'; he was formed, according to HERMES, in LACT. *Inst. Div.* ii. 10, 'after the image of God,' and according to OVID, *Met.* i. 83, 'after the image of the gods who govern all things.' CICERO, *De Nat. Deor.* i. 32, speaks of men as 'like the gods,' and refers, *De Leg.* i. 9, as also does JUVENAL, xv. 141-7, to their erect form, but also to their spiritual nature. ARATUS, *Phœnom.* 5, names men 'the offspring of Zeus,' which St. Paul, Acts xvii. 28, enlarges, to 'the offspring of God'; and the Pythagoreans taught 'a relationship of men with the gods,' DIOG. LAËRT. viii. 27, and imagined therewith that the soul was an effluence of the Deity, while others maintained also that 'in form it resembled the Deity,' PHILOSTR. *vit. Apoll.* viii. 7. Also PHOCYL. *Carm.* 101, names the spirit, 'the image of God.'—KNOBEL, *Gen.* p. 19.

1017. G. i. 30.

'To every animal of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is life, I have given every green herb for meat.'

The question would arise upon this, (were we obliged to regard this chapter as historically true,) how were the beasts and birds of *prey* to be supported—since their teeth and stomachs, and their whole bodily conformation, were not adapted for eating herbs? But, in fact, Geology teaches that ravenous creatures preyed upon their fellow-creatures, and lived upon *flesh*, in all ages of the world's past history, just exactly as they do now. Besides which, almost all fishes are carnivorous; and the leaves and stalks of vegetables, grasses, &c., swarm with living things, which are destroyed by the herbivorous animals.

1018. Dr. PYE SMITH writes on this point, *Geology and Scripture*, p. 87:—

Some persons have dreamed of sustaining animal life by exclusively vegetable food,—ignorant that in every leaf or root or fruit which they feed upon, and in every drop of water which they drink, they put to death myriads of living creatures, whose bodies are as 'curiously and wonderfully made' as our own, which were full of animation and agility, and enjoyed their mode and period of existence as really and effectively, under the bountiful care of Him, who 'is good to all, and whose tender mercies are over all His works,' as the stately elephant, the majestic horse, or man, the earthly lord of all. By far the larger portion of the animal creation is formed, in every part of its anatomy, internal and external, for living upon animal food, and cannot live upon any other.

KNOBEL observes, *Gen.* p. 20:—

According to the Hebrew view, then, men in the first age lived only on vegetables, and first in a later time were allowed to eat flesh, ix. 3. This is the general opinion of antiquity. According to PLATO, *De Leg.* vi. (22) p. 782, men abstained originally from eating flesh, because they regarded the slaying of animals as improper and sinful. So OVID, *Met.* xv. 96-8, *Fast.* iv. 395-7, allows men in the golden age only to feed on the produce of trees and herbs, but no flesh, and DIOD. SIC. i. 43, ii. 38, adduces the same with reference to the ancient Egyptians and Indians in particular. So too was it among the Syrians according to PORPHYR, *Abstin.* iv. 15.

1019. DELITZSCH here writes, p. 124:—

The Creation is designed for propagation and completion, not for destruction of life; the killing of one creature by another is contrary to the original will of God, which is here explained. With this Scripture notice we come, indeed, into difficulties, when we look at men of the present day, whose teeth, according to their construction, are distinguished certainly from those of the properly carnivorous, but not less from those of the properly herbivorous, animals, and (as also the intestines by reason of their length) are adapted for a mixed kind of nutrition, partly of animal, partly of vegetable food. Further, when we consider that it is the Law and Order of Nature, in the present world of plants and animals, that the life of the one is prolonged through the death of the other,—when we consider that strife, pain, oppression, murder, and robbery, lord it at present in all spots, all elements, all seasons, all classes of organic existence,—that not only visibly, but also invisibly, all the bodies of living creatures, innumerable large and microscopically-small parasites and murderers are found, (thus in the intestines of a small tortoise many thousand ascarides were found, eagles and vultures swarm with tormenting skin-parasites, and slugs, worms, and other tormentors plague the soft jaws of crocodiles and alligators),—that everything living is now in a continual war,—that it lies in the nature of certain animals to torture their prey in the most refined manner, and it seems as if it will and must be so, that, as limits are set to the excessive increase

of the vegetable world through the herbivorous animals, in like manner that of these is limited through the predaceous animals, and that of these latter through the death-dealing work of man,—when we consider all this, we are carried on to ask further, can it ever have been otherwise? Among the old-world animals, the creatures of the water and the slime, the partly fabulous Saurians were predaceous, and lived mainly on fish: their excrements, the so-called coprolites, show their great voracity, and contain still recognisable remains of animal food. OERSTED, the renowned discoverer of Electro-magnetism, urges confidently against MYNSTEN, the defender of the Church-dogma, this point,—*viz.* that, even in the old-world, animals have devoured other living animals, and that actually plain marks of disease have been found upon the bones of old-world animals. . .

There are here two problems; one concerns killing and death in the primary world, the other concerns killing and death in the mid-world. The right solution of the former we have already often indicated—[by the assumption that the geological remains are those of animals buried in the convulsions of the long-extended fifth-and-sixth days' periods. But *some* of these, at all events, must have received the blessing in v.22, though they were not allowed, it seems, to propagate their species, *viz.* those *fishes and birds* whose remains are found buried, *mixed with the remains of beasts*, since these latter could only have been made on the *sixth* day, and therefore the overwhelmed fishes and birds must have survived, and therefore must have received, the blessing on the *fifth*.] The second resolves itself, as we say with WAGNER, through the assumption, —[unknown to the Scriptures, which do not describe Adam as naturally immortal, but, on the contrary, ascribe his banishment from Paradise to the apprehension of Jehovah, that, if he remained there, he might take also of the 'tree of life,' and live for ever.]—that, as the body of man after the Fall underwent an essential change in its material basis, so also an analogous perversion and alteration took place in the animal world. [And yet the present forms of animals correspond in all essential particulars to those of the buried creatures of the old-world, which were formed, as DELITZSCH supposes,—and were not only formed, but lived out their time and died,—before the creation of man, in the course of the fifth and sixth days (1011)]

CHAPTER IX.

LEGENDS OF THE CREATION AMONG OTHER NATIONS.

1020. WE have thus seen that the statements in G.i, if regarded as statements of historical matter-of-fact, are directly at variance with some of the plainest facts of Natural Science, as they are now brought home, by the extension of education, to every village—almost, we might say, to every

cottage—in the land. It is idle for any Minister of Religion to attempt to disguise this palpable discordance. To do this, is only to put a stumbling-block in the way of the young,—at all events, of those of the next generation,—who, well-instructed themselves in these things, and having their eyes open to the real facts of the case, may be expected either to despise such a teacher as ignorant, or to suspect him as dishonest, and, in either case, would be very little likely to attach much weight to his instructions in things of highest moment.

1021. Yet we can clearly see that there are certain great principles,—the very core and centre of all true religious teaching,—which the pious writer of this chapter lays down distinctly amidst all his speculations upon the construction of the universe:—

(i) God is the Creator and Preserver of all things;

(ii) Man is made in the image of God;

(iii) All that God has made is very good.

We may add that he also appears to lay down distinctly this additional principle, that there is One Only True and Living God, whose Unity underlies the multifarious manifestations of His agency.

1022. These truths this writer must have received himself by the enlightening operation of the Spirit of Truth. And these truths, here uttered by a fellow-man of other days, we receive and embrace,—and I have known the untutored Zulu at once embrace them, when set before him, as heartily as the most learned European,—not because we find them written in a Book every word of which we believe to be infallibly true, but because the eye of our Reason, once enlightened, and having statements such as these set before it, approves them at once, as Divine Eternal facts,—because we see and feel them to be true. As surely as, with our bodily eyes, we see the Sun in the sky, and are certain of the real existence of external sensible objects, so surely, with the Mind's eye, can we see and rejoice in the glorious

reality of such spiritual verities as these.

1023. With respect to the mythical creation-stories of antiquity, Von BOULEN writes as follows, ii.p.3 :—

The most intimate relationship may be observed between the myth of Genesis and the Zend representation of Creation, which was composed near the same locality, and has a similar outline and succession of development. The universe is created in *six* periods of time by ORMUZD (Ahura-Mazda) in the following order: (i) the Heaven, and the terrestrial Light between Heaven and Earth, (ii) the Water, which fills the deep as the sea, and ascends up on high as clouds, (iii) the Earth, whose seed was first brought forth by Albordj, (iv) trees and plants, (v) animals, and (vi) lastly, Man, whereupon the Creator rested, and connected the divine origin of the festivals with these periods of Creation. We must remember, however, that Zoroaster had taken the old Magian system as the foundation of his reform, and had modified it to suit his purposes,—that, consequently, his cosmogony, is the old *Chaldean*, which very probably spread from the times of the Assyrians into Western Asia.

But the Bible narrative, apart from this common basis, far surpasses the description of the Zendavesta in simple dignity, and possesses a high intrinsic value in itself . . . On the other hand, the thought, 'Let there be Light, and there was Light,' which LONGINUS considered sublime, must not, remembering the limited conceptions of the writer, be rated too highly; and we may admit, without lowering the value of this cosmogony, that the Creation of the Hindoos, though a mere act of thinking and willing, was also very sublime, when it is said in the Vedas, 'He thought, I will create worlds, and they were there!'

1024. And so, too, says Dr. M'CAUL, *Aids to Faith*, p.189 :—

The *Etruscans* relate that God created the world in six thousand years. In the first thousand, He created the heaven and the earth,—in the second, the firmament,—in the third, the sea and the other waters of the earth,—in the fourth, the sun, moon, and stars,—in the fifth, the animals belonging to air, water, and land,—in the sixth, man alone.

The *Persian* tradition also recognises the six periods of creation, assigning to the first the heavens, to the second the waters, to the third the earth, to the fourth trees and plants, to the fifth animals, to the sixth man.

KNOBEL writes more fully, *Gen.p.4* :

The *Persian* tradition also betrays connection with this. Ormuzd (Ahura-Mazda) created through his Word (*Honover*) the visible world in six intervals or thousands of years; (i) the Light between Heaven and Earth, together with the Heaven and the Stars,—(ii) the Water, which covered the Earth, sank into its depths, formed, by means of wind, up-driven clouds, and then became enclosed by the Earth,—(iii) the Earth, and first, as the core and kernel of the Earth, the highest mountain, Albordj, then

the other mountains,—(iv) the trees,—(v) the animals, which all proceeded from the primary animal,—(vi) men, of whom the first was Kajomorts. After the completion of the Creation, Ormuzd kept a festival with the celestials.

1025. It is obvious that traditions such as these, which have so many remarkable points identically in common, must have proceeded from one and the same original story. And, although the late date of the works, whence our accounts of the Persian* and Etruscan traditions are derived, lays them open to the objection, that possibly they may have been influenced by a knowledge of the Hebrew story, we have no proof that this was actually the case, while many circumstances make it at least highly probable that they must have existed in the Mythology of the East long before the time of the Exodus.

1026. DELITZSCH, who maintains to the utmost the historical truth of the Scripture story, yet says, *Gen.p.80* :—

Whence comes the surprising agreement of the Etruscan and Persian legends with this section? . . . How comes it that the Babylonian cosmogony in BEROSUS, and the Phœnician in SANCHONIATHON, in spite of their fantastical oddity, come in contact with it in remarkable details? 'There was a time,' so begins the Babylonian cosmogony, 'in which all was *darkness and water*.' According to the Phœnician, the first human pair was produced by the *Kolpia*, 'the Divine Breath,' and his wife *Baau* (= *Bohu*, emptiness, G.i.2'] i.e. the matter of Night. These are only instances of that which they have in common. From such an accordance outside of Israel, we must, however, conclude that the author of G.i. has no vision before him, but a tradition. It might be replied, that the three cosmogonies just mentioned are only echoes of the first and second sections of the Hebrew Law, which had become known to the Babylonians, Phœnicians, and Persians. The points of contact are strange enough to lead to such a conjecture; and, whereas an influence of Jehovah-worship upon the religion of Babylon is altogether improbable, and an influence of

* The *Zendavesta*, whence the Persian tradition is taken, though containing many passages which are, apparently, of the most venerable antiquity, yet, in its present form, is, like the *Pentateuch*, a composite work, the product of different ages, and cannot, therefore, be used with perfect confidence as an authority for the *primitive* belief of the Persian people, any more than the *Pentateuch* can be used with perfect confidence for that of the Hebrews. The account of the Etruscan tradition is given by SUIDAS, who lived in the tenth or eleventh century of our era.

it upon that of the Phœnicians rather improbable, yet, on the other hand, an influence of it upon the Zend religion is very probable. If, however, here and there, the assumption of such an influence is allowable, yet it remains still certain that the author of G.I. has expressed in words an old tradition already existing. . . . And the interval of a week, within which G.I. completes the Creation,—how can that be anything visionary since the seven-days' week is a common ancient heritage of the Asiatic and African peoples, and probably, first of all, of the Babylonians?—nay, it is found actually existing among the American tribes as yet unchristianised(?), and in Africa with the Ashantes and Gallas. Among the Egyptians, the *civil* use of the seven-days' week has, certainly, not yet been demonstrated; as far back as the oldest times of the great Pyramids, we find the *ten-days' week*, which also is found among the Indians' *daçdha*, 'decade.' Still the seven-days' week was so well known to the Egyptians, that DION CASSIUS, xxxvii.17,18,19, notes the naming of the days of the week after the seven Planets as originally an Egyptian custom, which spread from Egypt also into the Roman Empire. [The Brahmins also distinguish the days of the week by the planetary names.] This consecration of the seven-days' week and of the number 'seven' generally, as may be conjectured, and as G.I. establishes, points back to a deeper, positive ground than that to which IDLER, LEPsius, EWALD, trace it, *viz.* the division of the Synodic month into four parts, of which each contains 7½ or, without a fraction, 7 days. Its ground is the cosmogonic legend. This is a primary legend, that has travelled from place to place. For as TUCH justly observes, the same fundamental tones are heard echoing under the most different harmonies, from the Ganges to the Nile.

1027. In short, DELITZSCH regards the story of the Creation, generally, and of the origin of the seven-days' week in particular, as a *legend*, *i.e.* an historical fact realised by the imagination, and not as a *myth*, *i.e.* an idea clothed in the form of an historical fact,—as when, for instance, a statement, expressing originally some fact in the natural world, has come in later days to be regarded as a piece of mere history, the original meaning having been forgotten. And, if the main details of these traditions, in which they are generally agreed, were found to accord with the certain facts of modern Science, we might conclude that the original tradition was actually based upon facts which had really occurred. As it is, we can only suppose that the story of the Creation,—which was current in the same form, substantially, and with some of the same remarkable

details, among so many of the ancient nations—must have been originated as a *myth*, in very ancient times, long before the Hebrew people had any existence, and before the great separation of the Aryan tribes.

1028. But what is a universal myth of this kind, in its essential features, but a *truth* uttered by the combined voice of humanity? The mind of man, in all ages and in all countries, musing upon the origin of all things, has been led by a Divine instinct to the same grand conclusions, which are expressed with more or less distinctness in all these mythical narratives,—and in many, which show no special relation to the Hebrew Type,—though nowhere so clearly and completely as in the Hebrew form, *viz.* that God is the Maker and Preserver of all things,—that all that God has made is good,—that man is made in the image of God. As we have said (1022), the Divine Spirit alone can have quickened such thoughts as these in the mind of the Elohist, whoever he may have been. But the same Divine Spirit, we must surely believe, taught the Hindoo Philosopher to say, 'He thought, I will make worlds, and they were there,' and taught also the Zulu first to say, though, as it were, with childish lips, 'Unkulunkulu—the Great-Great-One—made all things, made all men.'

1029. When, also, we find the seven-days' week spread over the world,—not in *all* nations, it is true,—were it so, there would be stronger proof of the reality of the historical fact to which the Bible ascribes its origin,—but over so many nations of the world, as DELITZSCH says, it is scarcely possible to doubt that the seven-days' week and the ten-days' week both owe their origin to the same cause—to the effort, namely, to divide the 29½ days of the lunar month into equal periods of shorter duration, more convenient for the common business of life. The Sun and Moon, as all men everywhere see, are set in the heavens to be 'for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years. Whatever else they may do, in the counsels of Divine Wisdom, they certainly do this, and are *meant* to do this, *for man*. The 'year'

and the 'month' are thus marked, even by the most savage tribes, as natural divisions of time. The Zulu keeps his Annual Feasts, and observes the New Moons, as the old Hebrews did: though he has not learned, in his natural state, to divide the month into weeks.

1030. But, if any sought to break up this longer interval into equal parts, it would be most natural to take the week of seven days,—the interval during which the Moon is seen to pass from one of its four chief phases to another: while others, as the more scientific Egyptians, might prefer to divide the month more accurately into three equal parts of ten days each.

The Peruvians divide the lunar month into halves and quarters by the Moon's phases, but have no names for the days; and, besides, they have a period of *nine* days, the approximate *third* part of a lunation, thus showing the common origin of both. (GARCIASSO, *Hist. of the Incas*, in TAYLOR'S *Nat. Hist. of Society*, i. 291-2). So also the Romans had their *nundinæ* or ninth day, which was a holiday even for slaves. The Greek lunar month, of alternately 29 and 30 days, was divided into decades of days. (Prof. BADEN POWELL, *Christianity without Judaism*, p. 90-2).

1031. GALLATIN writes, quoted in *Types of Mankind*, p. 294:—

Almost all the nations of the world appear, in their first efforts to compute time, to have resorted to lunar months, which they afterwards adjusted in various ways, in order to make them correspond with the solar year. In America the Peruvians, the Chilians, and the Muyscas proceeded in the same way—but not so the Mexicans. And it is a remarkable fact, that the short period of seven days (one week), so universal in Europe and in Asia, was unknown to all the Indians either of North or South America. [Had this learned and unbiassed philologist lived to read LEPsius, he would have excepted the Egyptians, who divided their months into *three* decades, and knew nothing of *weeks* or *seven* days. Neither did the Chinese, ancient or modern, ever observe a 'seventh day of rest.' GLIDDON.] All the nations of Mexico, Yucatan, and, probably, of Central America, which were within the pale of civilization, had two distinct modes of computing time. The first and vulgar mode was a period of *twenty* days,—which has certainly no connection with any celestial phenomenon, and which was clearly derived from their system of numeration or arithmetic, which was peculiar to them. The other computation of time was a period of thirteen days, which was designated as being the count of the Moon, and which is said to have been derived from the number of days when, in each of its revolutions, the Moon appears above the horizon during the greater part of the night. The Mexicans distinguished every one of their days of the period of twenty days

by a specific name, *Cipactli*, *Ehecatl*, &c., and every day of the period of thirteen days by a numerical order, from one to thirteen.

1032. CLEMENS ALEX., *Strom.* v. 256, quotes the following passages from ancient Greek poets, which imply that in the earliest ages a sanctity was attached to the number *seven* in other nations beside the Hebrew:—

'First, the first day, the fourth day, and the seventh,

Is sacred.'—HESIOD.

'On the seventh day the sun's resplendent light, &c.'—*Id.*

'When on the seventh arrived the sacred day.'—HOMER.

'The seventh day sacred was.'—*Id.*

'The seventh day is among good things,

The seventh day is a feast.'

'The seventh day is among the first,

The seventh day perfect is.'—CALLIMACHUS.

And the elegies of SOLON also greatly insist on the divine character of the seventh day.

It is true, CLEMENS refers all these to some knowledge of the Hebrew literature dispersed among the Greeks. But it is difficult to believe this of the times of HOMER and HESIOD; and it is far more probable that the number 'seven' was considered sacred from its connection with the 'seven planets' of those times, and the seven days of the approximate fourth part of a lunation.

The fact that HESIOD notes as sacred the *fourth* day also, *i.e.* the *middle* day of the *seven*, or the approximate seventh part of a lunation, agrees with this explanation.

1033. KALISCH writes on this point as follows, *Exod.* p. 449:—

The simple and obvious explanation of the holiness of the number *seven* is, that the ancient Israelites, as most of the Eastern nations, counted originally their months after the course of the Moon, which renews itself in four quarters of seven days each, and after this time assumes a new phase. These periodical and extraordinary changes of the Moon produced a powerful impression upon the susceptible minds of the ancient nations: they excited them to reflections on this wonderful phenomenon, and everything connected with it assumed in their eyes a peculiar significance. Hence the day of the *New Moon* was generally celebrated with some distinguishing solemnity, which, like all festivals, is regulated and fixed in the Mosaic Law: and the New Moon is in the O.T. frequently mentioned together with the Sabbath. Hereto we add that the number of the seven Planets known to them, Saturn, Jupiter, Mars, the Sun, Venus, Mercury, the Moon, which successively presided over the hours of the day, and each of which, therefore, commenced a different day, contributed in

later times not a little to secure to it that mysterious significance. But the division of the week into seven days was known and adopted by the most different nations, as the Assyrians, Arabs, Indians, (Chinese, Peruvians, but not the Persians), and many African and American tribes, which never came into intercourse with the Israelites, and later by the Greeks and Romans, who followed the Egyptians. We must, therefore, recognise therein, not an exclusively theocratical, but a general astronomical arrangement, which offered itself to the simplest planetary observation of every people.

1034. DELITZSCH, *Gen.p.84-88*, while clinging to the utmost to the traditionary view, yet admits, as the necessary result of his enquiries, the following points:—

(i) The Creation-story was not revealed to the writer of G.i.1-ii.3, whoever he may have been, but, if revealed at all—if it was not, in its original form, the expression of the clear-sighted intuition of man before the Fall,—it was revealed 'within the family of the first-made man,' and from them handed down by tradition, from Adam to Enos, &c., and from them to Noah and his family, by whom it was preserved—perhaps entire—till after the Flood.

(ii) At the 'confusion of tongues,' it was 'shattered by God himself,' and existed henceforward in broken fragments in different nations,—the most perfect, perhaps, in Babylonia.

(iii) From Babylon, perhaps,—or, perhaps, 'in direct line within the chosen family,'—the writer of G.i.1-ii.3 may have received the tradition, which, 'before it had reached him, had lived through many metamorphoses.'

(iv) The historical truth of this tradition, however, as now reported, is assured in all substantial points by the 'Divinity of the Law,'—[which is assumed,]—and 'the results of Natural Science,'—[by which, as we have seen, it is in many important particulars expressly contradicted.]

CHAPTER X.

GEN.II.4-II.25.

1035. G.ii.7.

'And Jehovah-Elohim formed the man (Adam) of dust out of the ground (Adamah).'

That a play on the words *Adam*, *Adamah*, (*comp.* the Latin, *homo*, *humus*), is here intended by the writer, though not expressly stated in the text, has been observed by most commentators. KALISCH notes, *p.105*:—

The origin of man from the earth is a notion extensively adopted. It was prevalent not only among the Greeks and Romans, but among the Peruvians,—who believed that, whilst the soul is immortal, the body consists of clay, 'because it becomes again earth,'—among the Caribbees and the North-American Indians. It was familiar to the Egyptians,

who considered man to have been formed from the slime of the Nile—to Hindoos, Chinese, &c. In the classical writings we find many analogous passages regarding the nature of man. EUHYPIDES says, *Supp.532-4*, 'The body returns to the earth from whence it was formed, and the spirit ascends to the ether'; and still more distinctly, LUCRETIVUS says, ii.997-1000, 'The earth is justly called our mother: that, which first arose from the earth, returns back into the earth; and that which was sent down from the regions of the sky, the regions of the sky again receive, when carried back to them.'

1036. G.ii.9.

'And out of the ground Jehovah-Elohim caused to-sprout every tree that is pleasant for sight and good for food.'

DELITZSCH here observes, *p.140*:—

The record does not say that the whole vegetable world first appeared after the creation of man, (which would directly contradict i.12.27, and which certainly seems to be implied in the story as related in ii.5-9); only the preparation of Paradise is mentioned after the creation of Man. Still the appearance of the Flora generally is brought close to the appearance of man, in a manner not to be reconciled with G.i. There the vegetable world has already appeared, when first the Stars, then the animals of the water and the air, and then the land-animals appeared; so that, after the appearance of vegetation, already two and a half creation-periods have elapsed, before man is created. Here, on the contrary, in order that vegetation might appear, there needed previous rain and the formation of man, &c., which formation is prepared beforehand in immediate connection therewith. The appearance of vegetation is so inextricably bound up with the entrance of these two preexisting conditions, that it is doing violence to the text, if we think of imagining whole series of other creations between vegetation and man. This is a contradiction between the two records, but, as we shall see further on, one not incapable of solution, and, what is more, very instructive.

We quote the above for the sake of this candid admission, on the part of so strong a defender of the traditionary view, that the discrepancy in question does, in fact, exist. We shall see hereafter in what way DELITZSCH proposes to 'solve' it.

1037. G.ii.11-14.

Of the four rivers of Paradise here named, the last, *Euphrates*, is certain; and, probably, *Hiddekel* and *Gihon* are, as JOSEPHUS says, (*Ant.I.i.3*), the *Tigris* and *Nile*, respectively, and *Pison*, probably, the *Indus*.

With respect to *Hiddekel*, properly *Khiddekel*, KALISCH writes, *Gen.p.92*:

This river has nearly the same name in the Aramean language and in Arabic, with the

omission only of the first letter, viz. *diglath*; and the Sam. Vers. [in the passage before us] has this abbreviated form with the article *had-dekel*. The root *dekel* signifies, in the Persian language, *arrow*, which name was given to the river on account of its swiftness; and in the present language of the Persians the Tigris is designated by the word *tir*, signifying *arrow*, Sanscr. *tigra*, hence *tigris*. The Hebrew *khiddekel* is evidently a compound word, contracted from *khad*, 'sharp,' and, *dekel*, = a *sharp* or *swift arrow*.

And again KALISCH notes, *Gen. p. 94*:

The Sept. renders *Shichor*, which is the Nile, in Jer. ii. 18, by *Ἰχὼν*, that is *Gihon*. JOSEPHUS observes distinctly, *Ant. l. i. 3*, that the Gihon flows through Egypt, and is that river which the Greeks call Nile. . . . The Arabians also include the Nile among the rivers of Eden, and the Ethiopians call it *Gejón* or *Gejón*.

1038. The Pison is not so easily identified, but the description of it, which is given in ii. 11, 12, seems to indicate the *Indus*. ARRIAN tells us, *Exp. Alex. vi. 1* :—

When Alexander the Great saw crocodiles and the Egyptian bean in the Indus, he thought that he had found the origin of the Nile, which he believed to rise in this part of India, and, after flowing through vast deserted regions, to lose the name of Indus; for, when it reaches again inhabited land, the Ethiopians and Egyptians call it Nile, and thus it falls at last into the Mediterranean Sea.

The 'land of Khavilah, which Pison bounds,' was probably *India* in the sense of the ancients, including Arabia.

Thus the four rivers appear to be Indus to the East, Nile to the South, Tigris to the North, Euphrates to the West. And KALISCH adds:—

In the Chinese tradition, four rivers flow from the mountain Kuen-lun to the four quarters of the world. And, in the sacred book of the Persians, the fountain Ardchsur, which rises in the holy mountain issuing from the throne of Ormuzd, is said to diffuse its waters over the whole earth by many canals.

1039. Here DELITZSCH asks, *p. 150*:

Is it, however, possible that the author has supposed the Indian Pison and the Nile, with the Tigris and Euphrates, to proceed out of one common source, and that source in fact, as is indicated by the mention of Tigris and Euphrates, in the highland of Armenia, which appears thus the starting-point, probably, of the first men, as well as of those after the Flood? Is it possible that he puts forward so strange an idea?

We, of course, can easily explain this phenomenon, by abandoning the notion of the *infallible accuracy* of the record, and supposing that the author wrote merely after the defective notions

of geography, which prevailed amongst the most learned of the ancients in even far later days, as we have just seen in the passage from the Life of Alexander. PAUSANIAS, ii. 5, maintained in like manner the identity of the Euphrates and the Nile. And JOSEPHUS, *Ant. l. i. 3*, considered the Euphrates, Tigris, and Nile to be branches of the same river; only, instead of the Indus, he reckons the Ganges. And, in short, it appears to us that, whatever may be the river meant by Pison, or even Hiddekel, the text of Genesis itself distinctly does unite the Nile and the Euphrates.

1040. VON BOHLEN observes, *ii. p. 34*:

The representation of KOSMAS [about A.D. 550] strikingly shows how fabulous was the view of the ancients. He imagines the earth to be an oblong, with a mountain inhabited by gods in the North: the sea flows round it on all four sides, and *beyond* the sea, towards the East, lies the Paradise in India. The intervening sea [which now separates the land of Eden from the inhabited Earth] was caused by the Flood, and was crossed by Noah. Under this sea the Euphrates and Tigris continue their course [from Eden], and appear again in the western world. Here is Gihon, the Ganges, which afterwards becomes the Nile in Egypt, in a manner somewhat similar to what Alexander imagined respecting the Indus. Pison, on the contrary, is the Indus, emptying itself into the Persian Gulf.

1041. DELITZSCH, however, is unwilling to allow the existence of such a mistake, and says, *p. 151*:—

We must, therefore, close the inquiry either by acknowledging that the notice in question is *unintelligible*, or we must submit to the necessity of admitting that, with the disappearance of Paradise, the more certain knowledge also of the four streams was lost; and the author only faithfully repeats the tradition, which regarded the Indus, Nile, Tigris, and Euphrates,—the four great beneficent streams of the ancient circle of history,—as finger-marks pointing back to the lost Paradise. It must be allowed as possible that the writer, or the tradition, has regarded the Nile as coming round about Ethiopia out of the North of Asia, and springing not far from the Indus or some one of the other Indian rivers. But we might with the same right assume that the four streams, without any further reference to their former unity, have been regarded only as *disiecta membra* of the no-longer-existing single stream of Paradise.

1042. But, as Dr. BURNET observes, *Arch. Phil. p. 288*:—

It is hardly conceivable that rivers of any kind, these or others, existed from the very origin of the earth,—[on the very *first day*, when 'Jehovah-Elohim had not yet caused-it-

to-rain upon the earth,' but only 'a mist went up from the earth, and watered the whole face of the ground,' ii.5,6,] whether you consider these *streams* or their *beds*. For the beds of rivers are usually made by gradual and long attrition. But, if you say, when the bed of the Ocean was made on the third day, the beds also of the rivers were made, and when the greatest part of the waters of the 'deep' sank into the abyss of the Sea, so the rest descended into these river-channels and formed the first rivers,—yet, besides that water of this kind would be *salt*, just like that of the Sea, there would be no perennial fountains for feeding these rivers, and therefore when the first stream had flowed down, or the first river—inasmuch as there were no waters to follow from behind,—these rivers, or these collections of water, would soon have dried up.

1043. G.ii.17.

'Of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day of thy eating of it, dying thou shalt die.'

VON BOHLEN observes, ii.p.39:—

On account of certain interpretations, we bring prominently forward some inconsistencies, which, however, we do not wish to impute to the simplicity of the narrator. Thus, at the beginning the man has to *watch* [guard] the garden; whereas the animals are not created until v.19, and they remain peaceably by him. Again, the first female transgressor, Eve, cannot have heard the prohibition of Jehovah when Adam received it, because she was not yet created; yet she repeats it in a more stringent form, iii.3, 'Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.' And the myth as little considers how the man himself could have understood the prohibition [i.e. the consequence of disobeying it], as he had not yet had death before his eyes.

Dr. PYE SMITH says, *Geology and Scripture*, p.322:—

The denunciation in G.ii.17 would seem to imply that they [he—the man?] understood *what* the penalty was, in consequence of their having witnessed the pangs of death in the inferior animals. [But did the man 'witness the pangs of death' *instantly* after his Creation, before he was put into Paradise,—or when?]

1044. The Jehovist, however, here writes evidently from a point of view quite different from that of the Elohist, who represents the Almighty as saying to the man and woman, i.29—

'Behold! I give you *every* herb . . . and *every* tree . . . to you it shall be for food';—whereas a prohibition is here given in the case of one particular tree,—not one of the whole earth, but a tree of the garden,—not to the man and woman, but to the man only.

1045. G.ii.19,20.

'And Jehovah-Elohim formed out of the ground every animal of the field, and every

fowl of the heaven, and brought it to the man, to see what he would call it, and whatsoever the man would call it, the living soul,—that should be its name. And the man called names to all the cattle, and to the fowl of the heaven, and to every animal of the field.'

We have noticed above (914) that in this passage not only are the beasts and birds formed *after* the creation of man, whereas in i.21,25,27, man is formed after the birds and beasts, but the fishes and reptiles are not mentioned at all.

1046. On this point DELITZSCH observes, p.157:—

When we look at G.i, where the animals after their kinds are all created *before* man, and endeavour to reconcile the two accounts by translating 'and He *had* formed,' instead of 'and He formed,' so as to state merely the fact which preceded his 'bringing' them, 'and so, having previously formed them, He brought them,—we do violence, as it appears to me, to the proper meaning of the narrator. It is better to allow the manifest contradiction to stand; at the end we shall gain more by that than by a hasty reconciliation.

When God has indicated to man his actual employment [to till and keep the garden], He wishes to give him a community to help him for it, and forms next the animals, which, certainly, are all meant to become useful to him. Only the 'fishes' [and reptiles] are not mentioned, because they, in the light in which the other animals are regarded, do not come into consideration.

1047. The reason, which DELITZSCH gives for the omission of the fishes, is probably true to some extent, though it would be far from explaining why *all* the beasts and birds should have been brought to Adam, and none of the reptiles and fishes, since the vast majority of the former cannot have been regarded as special 'helps' for him, any more than the latter. Still the few domestic animals are found among the 'beasts' and 'birds,' and supply, as we have said (914), some sort of companionship for man, which is not the case with the 'reptiles' and 'fishes': and this may account for the former being mentioned, and not the latter.

1048. But how could the White Bear of the Frozen Zone, and the Humming-Bird of the Tropics, have met in one spot? Or, being assembled, how could they have been dispersed to their present abodes,—with the beasts and birds of all kinds, of totally different habits and habitats, many of them ravenous creatures, that would have preyed on

one another, unless their fury was miraculously restrained, or their hunger was miraculously relieved, or their whole nature and bodily constitution changed, so that the lion should cease to be a lion, and eat grass like the ox? Or how could Adam have given names to *all*, it being remembered that, with the Hebrews, the word 'fowl' included (1009) all 'creeping-things that fly,' as the locust, L.xi. 20-23?

1049. It is painful, though almost ludicrous, to be obliged to sit down in this age of the world, in a day of widely-extended scientific education, and deliberately reason out such a question as this. But, in the interests of truth, there is no alternative, since influential and eminent men, distinguished by their attainments in science as well as by dignified ecclesiastical position, are still found defending the traditionary view with such arguments as the following,—I quote from Archd. PRATT, *Scripture and Science*, p. 49:

This difficulty need not stagger us, unexpected as it is. For, in the first place, it is not impossible that the regions, which are found on the opposite side of the globe, and others also, of which the limits are far from the boundaries of man's first residence, have become the scenes of creative power, at epochs *subsequent to the six-days' work*. [N.B. 'And the Heaven and the Earth were finished, and all their host,' ii. 1.] And, further, there is nothing in the account of the six-days' Creation militate against the idea, that Creation may have been going on over the whole surface of the Earth at the same time. It simply requires us to suppose that the animals, brought to Adam for him to name them, must have been *those only in the neighbourhood of Paradise*. [N.B. 'The man called names to *all* the cattle, and to the fowl of the heaven, and to *every* animal of the field,' ii. 20.]

DELITZSCH, too, assumes the actual historical truth of this statement, when he observes of the 'deep sleep' which fell on Adam, p. 159:—

This sleep is God's work, but caused by means of the *weariness* of the man, the natural consequence of his attention having been directed to so many different creatures, and deeply engaged in the contemplation of them.

1050. The question here involved is, of course, this, whether we are to believe, that there was originally *only one* centre of creation, or *more than one*? If *all* animals of every kind—we may suppose one, or a pair, of each—came to Adam to be named, then all

must have been created in, or in the neighbourhood of, Paradise itself. But can anyone suppose that all kinds of *plants* were created in Paradise, and only there, so that the seeds were scattered from thence to all ends of the earth,—as that of *maize* or *Indian corn*, for instance, which was not known to the Eastern Hemisphere till after the discovery of America,—or that all kinds of *reptiles*, *fishes*, and *insects* were formed only in the neighbourhood of Paradise? Why, then, must this be believed with respect to all kinds of beasts and birds, in direct contradiction to the conclusions of Modern Science, from which we learn that certain species of animals have lived all along, in particular regions of the earth, in the same fixed habitats, from an age long antecedent to the existence of man?

1051. Thus Prof. OWEN writes, *Address at Leeds*, 1858:—

Of the present dry land, different natural continents have different faunæ and floræ; and the fossil remains of the plants and animals of these continents, respectively, show that they possessed the same peculiar characters, or characteristic *facies*, during periods extending far beyond the utmost limits of human history, p. 3.

The class of animals, to which the restrictive laws of geographical distribution might seem least applicable, is that of *Birds*. Their peculiar powers of locomotion, associated in numerous species with migratory habits, might seem to render them independent of every influence, save those of climate and of food, which directly affect the conditions of their existence. Yet the long-winged *Albatross* is never met with north of the Equator; nor does the *Condor* soar above other mountains than the Andes. . . Several genera of *Finches* are peculiar to the Galapagos Islands; the richly and fantastically ornate *Birds of Paradise* are restricted to New Guinea and some neighbouring islands. . . Some species have a singularly restricted locality, as the *Red Grouse* to the British Isles, the *Owl-Parrot* to Philip Island, a small spot near New Zealand. The long-and-strong-limbed *Ostrich* courses over the whole continent of Africa and continuous Arabia. The genus of *three-toed Ostriches* is similarly restricted to South America. The *Emeu* has Australia assigned to it. The continent of the *Cassowary* has been broken up into islands, including, and extending from, the north-eastern peninsula of Asia to New Guinea and New Britain. The singular nocturnal wingless *Apteryx* is peculiar to the islands of New Zealand. Other species and genera, which seem to be, like the *Apteryx*, mocked, as it were, with feathers and rudiments of wings, have wholly ceased to exist, within the memory of man, in the islands to which they

also were respectively restricted. The *Dodo* of the Mauritius and the *Solitaire* are instances. In New Zealand also there existed, within the memory of the Maori ancestry, huge birds having their nearest affinities to the still-existing *Apteryx* of that island, but generically distinct from that and all other known birds. I have proposed the name of *Dinornis* for that now extinct genus, of which more than a dozen well-defined species have come to my knowledge, all peculiar to New Zealand. . . A tridactyle wingless bird of another genus, *Eppornis*, second only to the gigantic *Dinornis* in size, appears to have also recently become extinct—if it be extinct—in the island of Madagascar. The egg of this bird, which may have suggested to the Arabian voyagers, attaining Madagascar from the Red Sea, the idea of the Roc of their romances, would hold the contents of 6 eggs of the Ostrich, 16 of the Cassowary, and 148 of the common fowl. p. 34, 35.

The two species of *Orang* are confined to Borneo and Sumatra; the two species of *Chimpanzee* are limited to an intertropical tract of the western part of Africa. They appear to be inexorably bound by climatal influences, regulating the assemblage of certain trees and the production of certain fruits. With all our care in regard to choice of food, clothing, and contrivances for artificially maintaining the chief physical conditions of their existence, the healthiest specimens of *Orang* or *Chimpanzee*, brought over in the vigour of youth, perish within a period never exceeding three years, and usually under shelter, in our climate. p. 36.

Geology extends the geographical range of the *Sloths* and *Armadillos* from South to North America. But the deductions from recent rich discoveries of huge terrestrial forms of *Sloth*, of gigantic *Armadillos*, and large *Anteaters*, go to establish the fact, that these peculiar families of the order *Bruta* have ever been, as they are now, peculiar to America. p. 39.

The sum of all the evidence from the fossil world in Australia proves its mammalian population to have been essentially the same in pleistocene, if not pliocene times, as now; only represented, as the Edentate mammals in South America were then represented, by more numerous genera, and much more gigantic species, than now exist. p. 40.

1052. But, if this be so, then there arises also the question, whether all *mankind* are descended from one pair, or whether there may not be different races, generically alike—brothers, therefore, of one Great Family, having all the same precious gifts, of speech and thought, reason and conscience, proper to humanity,—but yet from the first differing as species. In that case, it would be no longer necessary to believe that the Bushman, Australian Savage, and Andaman Islander are only degraded descendants of Adam or Noah, and that the European, Chinese, Negro, and

North-American Indian are all derived from one pair of ancestors; and it would be possible to assume a different parentage from ours for those ancient makers of flint-implements, who lived, as scientific men assure us, many thousands—perhaps, tens of thousands—of years before the Scripture epoch of the Flood.

1053. Such questions as these must now be open questions, since we are no longer bound to believe in the historical infallibility of this composite record, which lies before us in the Book of Genesis. Meanwhile, the remarks of Dr. NOTT are very suggestive, *Types of Mankind*, p. 76 :—

These facts [quoted from Prof. AGASSIZ] prove conclusively that the Creator has marked out both the Old and New Worlds into distinct zoological provinces, and that Fauna and Flora are independent of climate, or other known physical causes; while it is equally clear that, in this geographical distribution, there is evidence of a *plan*,—of a *design* ruling the climatic conditions themselves. It is very remarkable, too, that while the races of men, and the Fauna and Flora of the Arctic region, present great uniformity, they follow in the different continents the same general law of *increasing dissimilarity*, as we recede from the Arctic and go South, *irrespective of climate*. We have already shown that, as we pass down through America, Asia, and Africa, the farther we travel, the *greater is the dissimilarity* of their Fauna and Flora, to their very terminations, even when compared together in the same latitudes or zones. And an examination will show, that differences of types in the human family become more strongly marked, as we recede from the Polar regions, and reach their greatest extremes at those terminating points of continents, where they are most widely separated by distance, although occupying nearly the same parallels of latitude, and nearly the same climates. For instance, the Fuegians of Cape Horn, the Hottentots and Bushmen of the Cape of Good Hope, and the inhabitants of Van Diemen's Land, are the tribes which, under similar parallels, differ most. Such differences of race are scarcely less marked in the Tropics of the Earth, as testified by the Negro in Africa, the Indian in America, and the Papuan in Polynesia. In the Temperate Zone we have, in the Old World, the Mongolians and the Caucasians, no less than the Indians in America, *living in similar climates, yet wholly dissimilar themselves*.

History, traditions, monuments, osteological remains, every literary record and scientific induction, all show that races have occupied substantially the same zones or provinces from time immemorial. . . The *Caucasian* races, which have always been the representatives of [the highest] civilisation, are those alone that have extended over, and colonised, all parts of the globe: and much of this is

the work of the last three hundred years. The Creator has implanted in this group of races an instinct, that, in spite of themselves, drives them through all difficulties to carry out their great mission of civilising the Earth. It is not reason, or philanthropy, which urges them on; but it is destiny. When we see great divisions of the human family increasing in numbers, spreading in all directions, encroaching by degrees upon all other races, wherever they can live and prosper, and gradually supplanting inferior types, is it not reasonable to conclude that they are fulfilling a law of nature?

1054. G.ii.22.

'And Jehovah-Elohim built the rib, which he took out of the man, into a woman.'

MILTON, *Par. Lost*, Book viii, appears to regard the act here described as having taken place only in a vision, though his language is painfully literal and graphic:—

Mine eyes He closed, but open left the cell
Of fancy, my internal sight; by which,
Abstract, as in a trance, methought I saw,
Though sleeping, where I lay, and saw the
shape

Still glorious before whom awake I stood;
Who, stooping, open'd my left side, and took
From thence a rib, with cordial spirits warm,
And lifeblood streaming fresh; wide was the
wound,

But suddenly with flesh fill'd up and healed;
The rib He form'd and fashion'd with His
hands.

1055. KALISCH notes, *Gen.p.91*:—

The Greenlanders believed that the first woman was fashioned out of the thumb of the man. It is, therefore, absurd to urge that the delicate body of woman was formed—not out of the dust of the earth, but—of organic matter already purified, or that the rib points to the heart of man and his love. The Hebrew historian intended to convey his idea of the intimate relationship between man and woman, and of the sacredness and indissolubility of conjugal life; and he expressed this idea in a form which was familiar to his contemporaries, and which will, at all times, be acknowledged as a beautiful and affecting mode of enforcing a moral truth of the highest social importance.

1056. G.ii.23,24.

'And the man said, This time this is bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh: therefore shall a man forsake his father and his mother, and cleave unto his wife, and they shall become one flesh.'

DELITZSCH says, *p.162*:—

Is this utterance a *prophetic* saying of Adam about marriage, or merely a *reflection* of the narrator? . . . It is, indeed, the custom of this writer [the Jehovist], to insert in the history remarks beginning, as this, with 'therefore,' x.9,xxvi.33,xxii.32. But these and similar remarks are all of an archaeological character, and lie within the historical matter-in-hand. On the contrary,

the remark in v.24 would be a pure reflection, without any explanatory object; and, as the story of the creation of the woman is only brought to a close in v.25, it would disturb the historical connection.

But then the first man would be represented as using these words, when he could as yet have had no idea of the relations of father and mother, or even of the nature of marriage itself. We might, therefore, suppose that v.24 may be a note of the Jehovist himself, as well as iii.20, 'because she was the mother of all living.' Still the context makes this supposition in both cases improbable.

1057. KALISCH remarks on the above text, *Gen.p.116*:—

We must not forget to mention that similar reflections to these are found in the holy books of the *Hindus* and *Persians*: 'The bone of woman is united with the bone of man, and her flesh with his flesh, as completely as a stream becomes one with the sea into which it flows.'

Thus in the Hindu marriage ceremony the husband says, *As.Res.vii.309*:

I unite thy breath with my breath, thy bones with my bones, thy flesh with my flesh, thy skin with my skin.

CHAPTER XI.

GEN. III. 1-III. 24.

1058. G.iii.1.

'And the serpent was subtle out of all animals of the field, which Jehovah-Elohim had made: and he said unto the woman, &c.'

DR. THOMAS BURNET observes, *Arch. Phil.p.295*:—

We read that all these great and multifarious matters were transacted within the short space of a single day. But I burn with pain, when I see all things upset and disordered in a little moment of time, and the whole nature of things, scarcely yet arranged and dressed out, sinking into death and deformity before the setting of the first day. In the morning of the day God said, that all was 'very good'; in the evening all is execrable. How fleeting is the glory of created things! The work elaborated through six days, and that by the Hand of Omnipotence, the infamous beast has destroyed in so many hours.

DR. BURNET would have been relieved of some part of his difficulties, if he had known that the statements which he contrasts were written by two different authors.

1059. We are now, however, arrived at the point where DELITZSCH produces his promised solution of the difficulties

noticed in (1046), which we commend to the reader's consideration: *Gen. p.164-9.*

But had then the animals at that time reason? Could the Serpent at that time speak? This question is too readily settled, if it is said that the Serpent is the symbol of pleasure (CLEM. ALEX. and others, after PHILO), or of the evil propensity (PHILLIPSON), or of the oned-sided understanding (BUNSEN). Others, who do not care at all if these fundamental histories are regarded as mere fables, maintain that the author has really meant that the animals could then speak. But, after it has been shown in chap.i that man was the conclusion of the progressive creations of God, and in ii.7 that God directly 'breathed into him the breath of life,' the author, surely, will not again displace the so-sharply-drawn boundaries of creation, and make now the beasts to be brothers and sisters of men, endowed with speech and, therefore, with reason! Let it be only considered that out of the Serpent speaks the deepest possible wickedness. That it speaks at all, is not a bit more strange than that it speaks such downright wickedness. That it speaks at all, is a wonder. That it speaks such utter wickedness, proceeds from this, that it is the instrument of a higher, but deeply-degraded, nature. It is thus a demoniacal wonder that it speaks. . . .

But when was it that evil entered into the Creation? We are here arrived at the point, where the two yet outstanding contradictions must be removed, *viz.* that G.i only knows of a creation (i) of plants, and (ii) of animals, *antecedent* to the creation of man, whereas G.ii brings them both back into close connection with the creation of man, [placing them, however, both *subsequent* to it]. So, then, when did evil enter into the creation? Not first *after* the six-days' work,—for the remains of animals and plants of the old world, ever coming before our eyes in greater number and variety, are acknowledged to be older than the origin of man; and not already *before* the six-days' work,—for the 'desolation and emptiness' concealed no Mollusks and Saurians; it was the conglomerated mass of a world very different from a world of such creatures as these, exhibiting themselves as lowest links in the chain of development of the present creation. . . .

Demoniacal powers have interfered with their work in the course of creation,—not, certainly, as demiurgic powers, which might have opposed contradictory caricatures to the creation of God, against which supposition Zoology raises a protest which must be admitted, since it shows in the old-world Fauna the same laws of construction and relations of form as in the existing,—probably, however, in such a way that they misled the Earth translated thus into misery, stirred up the dark fiery principle of the creature, and made unnatural intermixtures and mongrel formations, mutual murder, disease and death, common among the races of God-created animals (!) Thus the Divine Creation was not merely a working-out of the dark matter into a bright living form, but also a struggle with the might of evil; whole generations, called into

existence by God, yielded to the corrupting influence of that might, and must, consequently, be swept away. They were imbedded in the bowels of the mountains. The first act of the Third Day does not contradict this. For it consisted in the separation of the dry land from the water, not in unchangeable fixed definition of the earth's external form. The shaping of the mountains began on the Third Day, without having been brought to a close when plants and animals began to appear. The Earth became again and again the grave of the organic beings, which she had long borne upon her surface. If we cast a glance forwards, the reason for the judgment of the Flood, vi.1-4, will show us that we are saying nothing strange to the Scriptural view. Also the story of the temptation of man entitles us to look backwards. The creation of the Earth and its inhabitants was, in some sense, a struggle of the Creator with Satan and his powers, as the redemption is a struggle of the Redeemer with Satan and his powers. This background of the Creation is veiled in G.i; the writer has purposely veiled it; but we, to whom, through the N.T. Revelation, an open look is allowed into the vanquished kingdom of darkness,—we know that the 'and behold! it was very good' is a word of victory, and that the Divine Sabbath is a rest of triumph, similar to the 'it is finished' of the Redeemer and the triumphal-march of the Ascension. . . . The Nature, which was taken possession of by the spirits of evil, is destroyed, and—here is the solution of the two contradictions—a plant-world and an animal-world have now come into being, (as the last links of the plant-and-animal-creation which was *begun* with the third and sixth days,) such as corresponds to him, who is called to be lord and conqueror of evil, *viz.* Man. . . .

It is now clear why Satan seeks to mislead the man, against God's command, to taste the deadly fruit of the Tree of Knowledge; he wishes to destroy man, and, with him, the whole of the *last* creation. . . . It is clear also why he, since his power of destruction is so limited and confined in the paradisaical plant-world, makes use of a beast in order to befool man, and to enslave him together with the last of the creations. The narrator confines himself to the *external* appearances only of the event, without raising the veil from the being behind. He might well have raised it, since even the heathen legend gives a full, though distorted, account of it; but he veils it, because the unveiling would not be good for the people of his time, inclined to heathenish misbelief, and heathenish intercourse with the demon-world (!). That the Devil himself tempted the first pair, says the Book of Wisdom, ii.23,24. It was also not so unknown to the narrator as might appear from his silence, since, even in the human race external to Israel, a consciousness of this meets us in many a legend and mythology. . . . The Serpent is the first creature, through which Ahri-man corrupts the first-created land of Ormuzd; Ahri-man is represented as appearing in the form of a Serpent, and is even named the Serpent.

1060. The reader will perceive that,

in order to reconcile the contradiction, which DELITZSCH admits to exist between the two accounts of the Creation, in respect of the *order* in which Man and the animals were created, he is driven to make the following assumptions:—

(i) The creation was a 'struggle' between the Divine Creator and the 'might of evil';

(ii) The Evil One prevailed so far as to 'mislead' the animals created in the fifth day, i. 21, and in the sixth *before* the creation of man, i. 25;

(iii) Hence all these animals, beasts, birds, reptiles, fishes, insects, &c., were obliged to be 'swept away,' together with the *vegetation*, created on the third day, i. 12;

(iv) A new creation of plants and beasts and birds took place on the sixth day, *after* the creation of man, as related in ii. 9, 19,—[but what of the *reptiles* and *fishes*?];

(v) The Evil Spirit tried to corrupt this last creation also, and, therefore 'made use of a beast' in order to deceive the woman.

1061. G.iii.8.

'And they heard the sound of Jehovah-Elohim walking in the garden in the breeze of the day.'

DELITZSCH explains this and other 'anthropomorphisms' as being direct consequences of the *Fall*, as follows, p. 176:—

In this state they perceive the sound of God's footstep. God draws near to them, as one man to another. That this was the mode, in which God *originally* had converse with man, is not true. That, from this point onward, the sacred history marks such an outward distinction between God and man, has its good reason in this, that through the Fall the inner unity of God and man is really lost, and now a gradual return to approximation on both sides begins. Only then, when man has lost the uniform inner presence of God's Love, begin the (theophanies) Divine appearances. Now, for the first time, God has intercourse with man in an external form like this, corresponding to his changed condition. The relation of Love is broken. This is what is now also historically manifest, with a view to the historical restoration of it. The anthropomorphism of the mode of intercourse culminates in the Incarnation (!)

Dr. LIGHTFOOT defines here the exact time of day, *Harm.*, &c., p. 5:—

with day of creation . . . his (Adam's) wife the weaker vessel; she not yet knowing that there were any devils at all . . . sinned, and drew her husband into the same transgression with her; this was about *high noon*, the time of *eating*. And in this lost condition, into which Adam and Eve had now brought themselves, did they lie comfortless, till towards the cool of the day, or *three o'clock afternoon*.

1062. G.iii.14.

'Upon thy belly shalt thou go, and dust shalt thou eat, all the days of thy life.'

Here the serpent is represented as having had its nature degraded and debased from what it was originally.

JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* i. 4, and after him the Fathers generally, conceived of the serpent as having had originally a human voice and legs. And DELITZSCH at this very day maintains that the serpent's form was actually changed, in consequence of its having been used by Satan as the instrument of his deception, p. 180:—

The punishment of the serpent, as all antiquity understood the sentence, consists in this, that its mode of motion and its form were changed. The consequence of sin is ever something abnormal, which lies beyond the proper end of creation: it works deformity, as in the human body, though that is wholly the instrument of the spirit, so also upon the serpent, though it has only been the instrument of a spirit. The serpent was before made otherwise. Now, with its fiery colour, its forked vibrating tongue, its poison-distilling teeth, its dreadful hiss, its arrow-like motion, like a flash of light, its occasionally fascinating glance, it is, as it were, the embodiment of the diabolical sin and the divine curse. This its present condition is the consequence of a divine transformation, and, as its speaking is the first demoniacal wonder, so this is the first divine transformation. Of the original condition of the serpent it is, certainly, impossible to frame to ourselves a conjecture. We might imagine generally a machine, perhaps, but no living creature, were it even a chimera; and even the reconstruction of one, that has previously existed, is impossible for us without given remains and indications.

1063. But Geology shows us that the serpent was the same kind of creature, in the ages long ago, before men existed upon the earth, as it is now. And the notion, that the Devil took possession of the serpent, and used it as an instrument for his malicious purpose, is disproved at once by the words of the curse, which charge the crime upon the *serpent* itself,—

'Because thou hast done this, thou art cursed above all cattle and beasts of the field,'

—as well as by the expressions, 'upon thy belly shalt thou go,' 'dust shalt thou eat,' which refer distinctly to the animal. Is it possible to believe that a curse could have been passed by the Gracious Creator upon an innocent animal, which the Devil had mastered, —while no mention is made of the

Devil himself being punished? As well might we believe that the Almighty Father would curse a human being afflicted with madness!

1064. Dr. THOMAS BURNET says, *Arch. Phil.* p. 291 :—

But you will say, 'The woman ought to have been careful, not to violate a law enforced by the penalty of death.' 'On the day on which you shall eat thereof you shall die, you and yours,' so ran the law. 'Die! what does this mean?' says the virgin in her ignorance, who had never yet seen anything dead, not even a flower, nor had felt yet death's image, *sleep or night*, with her eyes or with her mind. And, as to what you add about her *posterity* and the *penalty upon them*, nothing of this is expressed in the law. But no laws ought to be twisted,—certainly not penal laws.

Also no light difficulty arises about the punishment of the serpent. If the Devil did the whole under the form of a serpent, or if he compelled the serpent to do or suffer all this, why is the serpent punished for the crime committed by the Devil? Then, as to the manner and form of the punishment inflicted on the serpent, viz. that hereafter it should go on its belly, it is not easy to explain what this means. It will hardly be said that the serpent was formerly erect, or walked after the manner of quadrupeds. But, if it went upon its belly from the first, as serpents do now, it may seem unmeaning that something should be imposed on this animal, as a punishment and penalty for a particular deed, which it had always by nature.

1065. On the point of the serpent's 'eating dust,' KALISCH says, *Gen.* p. 125:

The great scantiness of food, on which the serpent can subsist, gave rise to the belief, entertained by many Eastern nations, and referred to in several Biblical allusions, that they 'eat dust,' Mic. vii. 17, Is. lxxv. 25. *Sil. Ital.* vii. 449, *ferventi pastus arenâ*, 'feeding on hot sand,'—see BOCHART, *Hier.* i. 4, ROBERTS'S *Illustr. of Scripture*, p. 7,—while the Indians believed them to feed upon wind.

And, as to the 'enmity' between the woman's seed and the serpent, he adds:

In many Eastern religions, the extirpation of the reptiles, and especially of the serpents, was enjoined as an important duty. Among the *Persians*, it was considered as equivalent to the war for Ormuzd and against Ahriman, and the most sacred festival was consecrated to this 'destruction of evil.' HEROD. i. 140. The *Hindoo*s celebrated similar great feasts for the same purpose; and in *Cashmere* solemn sacrifices were offered for the annihilation of the serpents. (FRANK, *Vyasa*, p. 139.) Thus the 'open enmity' between man and the serpent recurs throughout the whole Orient. It is everywhere impressed with a religious character; it bears a hidden symbolical meaning; it is the combat either against the Tempter, or against the Prince of Evil.

Among the *Zulus*, on the contrary, the snake is held in great respect, and

is not willingly killed; as their dead ancestors are supposed to reappear in the form of snakes. So among the *Greeks* the serpent was the emblem of healing wisdom; while to the *Phœnicians* it became the symbol of eternity, from its habit of coiling itself into a circle.

1066. G. iii. 15.

'And enmity will I put between thee and the woman, and between her seed and thy seed: it shall bruise thee on the head, and thou shalt bruise it on the heel.'

KALISCH notes, *Gen.* p. 89 :—

Krishna also, as the incarnation of Vishnu, is represented now as treading on the bruised head of a conquered serpent, and now as entwined by it, and stung in the heel.

And so says Mr. SHARPE, *Egyptian Mythology*, p. 45 :—

The serpent of evil, the great enemy of the human race, plays an important part in all [Egyptian] pictures and sculptures relating to the next world. . . . When it is pierced through the head by the spear of the goddess Isis, we see the enmity between the woman and the serpent, spoken of in G. iii. It is always conquered by the good, sometimes pierced through its folds by a number of swords, and sometimes carried away alive in the arms of its conquerors in triumph.

1067. Accordingly, the usual explanation of the above passage is, that the 'seed of the serpent' typifies in some way the Devil and all that belongs to him; while the 'seed of the woman' represents *JESUS CHRIST* and all true believers; the 'serpent' shall bruise the woman's seed on the *heel*, i.e.—shall have power to injure, but not *fatally*; while the 'seed of the woman' shall bruise it on the *head*, i.e.—shall crush and utterly destroy the power of evil. So writes DELITZSCH, p. 182 :—

The crafty venomous bite of the snake on the heel of man, which he retaliates, without having suffered fatal injury, by crushing its head with his foot, shadows forth the conflict of the human race with the Devil and all who are 'of the Devil,'—and who are, therefore, not so much the woman's as the serpent's seed,—and the decisive victory of the human race, in which this conflict ends.

1068. It is probable that the deadly conflict of man with evil is symbolised in this narrative by the mortal hatred, which, for very natural reasons, exists almost everywhere between the human race and the serpent tribe. So most people have a dislike of *scorpions*, Lu. x. 19, *spiders*, &c. But it is doubtful

if the injury is here supposed to be mortal in the one case, and not in the other. The serpent stings the heel,—that part of the man which is most accessible to its bite,—whenever it has an opportunity of doing so, with a fatal power; while the man, in like manner, wreaks his vengeance on the serpent by crushing its head.

1069. Thus WILLET writes, *Hexap. in Gen. p. 51*:—

Part of this sentence is literally true in the serpent. For, as RUPERTUS noteth, if a woman tread upon the serpent with her bare foot, he presently dieth; but, *if he first bite her heel, the woman dieth of that poison*. But, howsoever this be true, it is most certain that between man and those venomous creatures there is a natural hatred, that one cannot endure the sight and presence of the other. Some do marvel why the serpent is not made mute and dumb, seeing Satan abused his tongue and mouth to tempt the woman. The Hebrews think that the punishment is included, in that dust is appointed to be his meat; for such, whose mouths are filled with earth, cannot speak. And to this day we see that the punishment remaineth upon the serpent, who *maketh no perfect sound, as other cattle do, but hisseth only* (!)

1070. G. iii. 16.

‘Unto the woman He said, Multiplying I will multiply thy pain and thy conception; in pain shalt thou bear children.’

There is no reason to suppose that the pain of childbirth has really been *increased* to the woman. It would arise—from the natural conformation of her body, if she was to bear children at all; and the Elohistic command to ‘fructify, and multiply,’ i. 28, implies that she was meant to do so from the first. So, too, the mention by the Jehovist of a man ‘leaving his father and mother,’ ii. 24, shows that in the view of this writer, also, the idea of *parentage* was entertained as existing, even in Paradise, before the Fall. In tropical countries, indeed, the birth of a child seems often to be attended with little more pain and disturbance than the birth of a beast. It is merely the imagination of the Hebrew writer, which ascribes the pain of childbirth, and the natural subjection of the female to the male, (which also is not peculiar to man amongst animals,) to her being foremost in sin.

1071. DELITZSCH, however, assumes a change in the woman’s form, p. 184:—

That the woman shall become a mother, is God’s original will; but the punishment is, that she shall henceforth bear children with pains, which threaten her life as well as the child’s. This sentence also upon the wife changes the original state of things judicially; and, since the woes indicated are necessarily grounded on the present physiological condition of the woman, this also must have undergone a change, without our being able to frame to ourselves a conception of the original state of things.

And again he writes, p. 184:—

It was intended from the first that the man should have a certain superiority over the woman. But only now, when the harmony of their mutual wills in God is disturbed, this superiority is changed to *lordship*: the man can command in a lordly manner, and the woman is from without and within compelled to obey. In consequence of Sin there exists that subjection, bordering on slavish, of the woman to the man, which, as it is still in the East, was in the old-world usual, and which *first through the religion of Revelation* has been by degrees made more endurable, and equalised with the human worth of the woman.

TACITUS, however, says of the ancient Germans, *Germ. viii*:—

Moreover, they think that there is something sacred, or gifted with foresight, in their women; nor do they either despise their counsels, or neglect their prophetic utterances.

1072. G. iii. 17, 18.

‘Cursed is the ground for thy sake: in pain shalt thou eat of it all the days of thy life; and thorns and thistles shall it make-to-sprout to thee; and thou shalt eat the herb of the field; in the sweat of thy face thou shalt eat bread.’

Here the ground is represented as cursed for man’s sake, and on this account bearing briars and thorns, and requiring to be cultivated with hard labour.

But Geology shows that the state of things upon the Earth, before man appeared upon it, was just the same as it is now. There are no signs of any curse having passed upon the Earth. Thorns and briars were as plentiful in the primeval world as they are now. The same abundant crop of weeds would have sprung up, under the same circumstances, *then as now*, on any ground uncared-for. And man, if he had lived then, could only have eaten bread by the sweat of his brow, in those days as now.

1073. And, in fact, a life of toil and exertion is far more healthy, joyous, and ennobling,—far more suited to man’s bodily and spiritual nature,—

far better adapted to draw out his highest faculties, than one of inactivity and careless ease, such as the life of Paradise is generally imagined to have been. It is the kind of life evidently *meant* for man by his Creator, the life for which man was made,—the *normal* kind of life which, when not excessive in its labours, is natural and pleasant to him, happy and health-giving, and not one to remind him at all of sin and of the curse.

1074. G.iii.19.

'Until thy returning unto the ground, for out of it wast thou taken: for dust art thou, and unto dust shalt thou return.'

Reddenda est terræ terra, 'Earth to earth must be returned,' says EURIPIDES, in *Cic. Tusc.* iii. 25.

This appears to be the writer's mode of accounting for death in the human race. And DELITZSCH observes, *p.* 189:

With the man, however,—the threatened one,—a change has now taken place. When he was threatened, he was only *one*. Now he is man and woman. Through the fact, that God has given him the woman, arises on the one side the possibility of a diminution of the fault, on the other the possibility of a fulfilment of the threatening, without breaking off human history. It is now possible that the man may die, without the human race coming to an end.

1075. But Geology shows that living creatures of all kinds died in the ages long ago, as they die now,—died, overwhelmed by floods, or falling earth, or the fiery streams poured out by volcanoes,—died by old age or the action of disease, their bones being found distorted, carious, or twisted with pain,—died often tearing and devouring one another, even as now, the bones of one animal being found in the stomach of another. As Dr. PYE SMITH says, *Geology and Scripture*, *p.* 89:

We can see and examine their powerful teeth, the structure of their bones for the insertion, course, and action of muscles, nerves, and the tubes for circulation, indicating the functions, and their very stomachs, beneath their ribs, replenished with chewed bits of bone, fish-scales, and other remains of animal food.

Death, therefore, has been in the world from the very first, as the universal law for the animal as well as for the vegetable creation. And there is nothing to compel us to believe,—even if we could gather a definite mean-

ing to that effect from the Hebrew writer, which, perhaps, we cannot,—that man's mortal frame would have endured for ever, any more than those of other animals similarly constituted to his.

1076. Yet it may be questioned if this passage of Scripture really means to say that death was inflicted as the penalty of sin, notwithstanding the interpretation put upon it by the later Jews, *Wisd.* ii. 24, *Ecclus.* xxv. 24. For, as KNOBEL observes, *p.* 49:—

According to the Bible, Adam is not to die because he has *sinned*, but because he was 'taken out of the ground,'—because he 'is dust,' he shall 'return to dust.' Hence he was created mortal; through his original nature, according to which he is exposed to death, it is plain he dies. He *might* have gained immortality through the tree of life, *ii.* 9, but only as something over and beyond his created nature, only as a prerogative of the celestial beings. But, because he wilfully appropriated to himself another prerogative of the spiritual powers, and was not yet to become like to these, he was prevented from this, and death took place, in accordance with his original nature. That prevention of further encroachment on the prerogatives of the spiritual, and this entrance of the original destiny of man, cannot be said to be the infliction of death as the punishment of sin. God cannot be said to have taken from Adam immortality,—which he did not at all possess,—and to have inflicted on him death,—which from the beginning was to have been expected. But He left him simply with his original mortality, which finally took effect through death.

And, indeed, Bishop JEREMY TAYLOR is quoted by Archd. PRATT, *p.* 48, as having written thus, two centuries ago:

That Adam was made mortal in his nature, is infinitely certain, and proved by his very eating and drinking, his sleep and recreation, &c. That death, which God threatened to Adam, and which passed upon his posterity, is not the going out of this world, but the manner of going. If he had stayed in innocence, he should have gone placidly and fairly, without vexatious and afflictive circumstances; he should not have died by sickness, defect, misfortune, or unwillingness.

1077. It need hardly be said, however, that the above explanation of this scientific difficulty, though supported by the authority of so eminent a writer, does not satisfy the ardent defenders of the traditional view, or those who have imbibed (as unhappily we have, most of us, from childhood) the defective theological teaching of that great poet, who wrote—

Of man's first disobedience, and the fruit
Of that forbidden tree, whose mortal taste
Brought Death into the world.

Accordingly, Archd. PRATT, who quotes it, does not agree with the writer, but referring to Rom. v. 12,—

'As by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin,'

—he admits that death was in the world before man's sin, but reconciles the difficulty as follows:—

Science here comes to our aid, to correct the impressions we gather from Scripture (!); and the lesson we learn from the Apostle is, not that death had never appeared, even in the irrational world, before the Fall of man, but that, in that fearful event, sin had degraded God's intellectual creature to the level of the brutes in his animal nature, and in his spiritual, to that of a lost and fallen being. Death received its horrors when it fell upon man, who alone was made in the image of God.

1078. Prof. HITCHCOCK writes as follows, *Geology*, p. 73:—

The common theory of Death maintains that, when man transgressed, there was an entire change throughout all organic nature; so that animals and plants, which before contained a principle of immortal life, were smitten with the hereditary contagion of disease and death. Those animals which, before that event, were gentle and herbivorous or frugivorous, suddenly became ferocious or carnivorous. The climate, too, changed, and the sterile soil sent forth the thorn and the thistle in the place of the rich flowers and fruits of Eden. The great English Poet, in his 'Paradise Lost,' has clothed this hypothesis in a most graphic and philosophical dress; and, probably, his descriptions have done more than the Bible to give it currency. Indeed, could the truth be known, I fancy that, on many points of secondary (?) importance, the current theology of the day has been shaped quite as much by the ingenious machinery of the 'Paradise Lost,' as by the Scriptures,—the theologians having so mixed up the ideas of Milton with those derived from Inspiration, that they find it difficult to distinguish between them.

The truth is that we literally groan, even in the present day, under the burden of Milton's mythology.

1079. No mention, however, is made of the *immortality of the soul*, of life after death, in this passage, G. iii. 19; and, indeed, in the writer's view, apparently, the death of the body was the end of all, as is so mournfully intimated in the Psalm of Hezekiah, Is. xxxviii. 10-20. Nor does he draw any strong distinction between the nature of man and the brute creation: both man and beast are formed by

Jehovah-Elohim Himself, out of the ground, ii. 7, 19, each is called a 'living soul,' ii. 7, 19, each has 'in its nostrils the breath of life,' ii. 7, vii. 22. DELITZSCH takes note of this, p. 143, 190, and places the excellency of man in this, that of him only it is said, that,—
'Jehovah-Elohim breathed into his nostrils, &c.'

1080. But it seems doubtful if the writer intended to express this difference. By whom was the spirit of life breathed into the nostrils of any of the creatures, unless by Jehovah-Elohim? In the later Hebrew writings, indeed, we find, apparently, a distinction drawn between the 'spirit of a man that goeth upward,' and 'the spirit of a beast that goeth downward to the earth,' Eccl. iii. 21. And though the writer says, v. 19, 20,—

'That which befalleth the sons of men, befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them: as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one spirit ('breath'); so that a man hath no preeminence above a beast: for all is vanity; all go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again'—

yet he seems to allow a preeminence to the spirit of man above that of the beast, both in the words of iii. 21 above quoted, and in those of xii. 7, where, speaking of the death of man, he says,—

'Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit unto God who gave it.'

1081. Yet even this is doubtful, since 'spirit' here means, probably, the same as in Eccl. iii. 19, where it is said that man and beast 'have all one spirit,' and therefore the language here used of man might be used of beasts also. And again, in iii. 21, 'Who knoweth the spirit of a man?' &c., the construction of the interrogative, without a negative, implies rather a negative answer, as in Is. xl. 13, 14, 'Who hath directed the Spirit of Jehovah?' &c.,—or Is. liii. 1, 'Who hath believed our report?'—where the answer is meant to be, 'No one.' So here the meaning may be, 'No one knows whether the spirit of man goeth upward, and the spirit of a beast downward.'

1082. DELITZSCH takes account of some of the natural and necessary phenomena of death, in the natural world

of plants, animals, &c., before the Fall, as follows, p. 187 :—

To come into being and be deprived of being, to be formed and unformed, to appear and to pass away, are certainly grounded in the essence of natural life, and it is true that the right of the individual among the creatures properly first begins with man. Thus, even without the sin of man, the individual formations of nature could not have existed eternally; they would, generally, have been returned to that from which they were taken, but without that anguish-and-torment-fraught, for the most part violent, death, and that offensive air-polluting putrefaction, which the Scripture names 'death' and 'corruption.'

1083. The fact is, in short, that we have every reason from Science to suppose that for man, as well as other animals, in his natural normal state, death is necessary,—that his body also will at length be worn out naturally, as those of the innumerable living creatures of all kinds, which have died in the ages before him, by the wear-and-tear of seasons, which are just the same now as in the days of old, or that men may come, perhaps, to an untimely end, by such accidents as those which have buried so many beasts, birds, reptiles, fishes, insects, &c., as well as plants, of past ages, in the very prime of their strength, and in the midst of their activity.

1084. But then man's nature is a glorious spiritual nature, conscious of personal identity, prescient, desirous of a future life,—a nature fitted to have converse with the good and the true and the beautiful, which things endure for ever,—a nature that can live in eternity, that even now has kindred with the Divine, that can be filled with the Light and Life of God. There is good reason, therefore, for believing that the dissolution of this mortal framework of the human body will not be the death of the spirit of man.

1085. G.iii.21.

'And Jehovah-Elohim made to Adam and to his wife coats of skin, and clothed them.'

DELITZSCH takes this passage as being literally and historically true. He makes this act, however, one of great significance, p. 192 :—

Man, in consequence of sin, needs a covering to hide his nakedness. He himself has made the attempt to cover his nakedness by his own contrivance; however, he has not succeeded; before God he cannot present himself with his

fig-leaves. Only God Himself prepares for him a covering, which may serve for man to appear in before God,—and that from the skins of slain animals, and, therefore, at the cost of innocent life, at the expense of the shedding of innocent blood. This blood was an image of the blood of Christ, this clothing an image of the clothing of righteousness in Christ . . . The original couple, clothed by God Himself, upon believing apprehension of the word of promise, are the image of all men justified through faith in Christ.

It is of course allowable for any to draw out such analogies, provided that they are not enforced as articles of faith, or as really meant to be conveyed in a passage like this.

1086. G.iii.24.

'And he placed in front of the Garden of Eden the cherubs.'

Dr. THOMAS BURNET writes as follows, *Arch. Phil.* p. 293 :—

The text says, v. 7, 'They sewed together fig-leaves, and made to themselves girdles.' Here we have the first step in the art of sewing. But whence had they a needle, whence a thread, on that first day of their creation? These questions may seem to be too free; but the matter itself demands that we act freely, when we are seeking the naked truth. When, however, they had made to themselves girdles, God gave them besides coats, made, forsooth, out of the skins of beasts. But here again we run into difficulties. To soften the matter, let us substitute in the place of God an angel. An angel, then, slew and skinned the animals, or stripped the skin from innocent and living animals. But this is the business of a slaughterer, or butcher, not an angel. Besides, through this slaughter, *whole races of animals would have perished*; for it is not believed that more than two of each kind were created at first; and one without the other, its male, would have had no offspring.

After all this, however transacted, what follows? God drove our parents, thus clothed in skins, out of Paradise, and placed at the entrance of the garden cherubim, with a flaming turning sword, lest they should reseek the blessed abode by force, or even by accident. Is there any interpreter who will bend this to the letter, and will assert that angels stood, like guards, with drawn swords, before the entrance of the garden through I know not how many ages—as the dragons are said by the poets to have guarded the apples of the Hesperides? Why, how long did these angelic watchers last? To the Deluge, I suppose, if not longer. Do you believe that angels were so occupied, for more than 1,500 years, in keeping a garden night and day? How easy would it have been, in a well-watered place like Paradise, to have surrounded the garden with a stream or river, which would have been an abundantly sufficient obstacle to Adam and Eve, who knew nothing as yet of the use and construction of boats or ships! But these and such-like considerations, lest they should seem invidious, I would rather leave to be pondered by others.

CHAPTER XII.

STORIES OF PARADISE AND THE FALL
IN OTHER NATIONS.

1087. The *Persian* myth, describing the Fall of Man, which bears a striking resemblance to the story in Genesis, is thus given by KALISCH, *Gen.* p. 87:—

The first couple, the parents of the human race, *Mesha* and *Meshiane*, lived originally in purity and innocence. Perpetual happiness was promised to them by Ormuzd, the Creator of every good gift, if they persevered in their virtue. But an evil demon (*Dee*) was sent to them by Ahriman, the representative of everything noxious and sinful. He appeared unexpectedly in the form of a serpent, and gave them the fruit of a wonderful tree, *Hôm*, which imparted immortality, and had the power of restoring the dead to life. Thus evil inclinations entered their hearts; all their moral excellence was destroyed. Ahriman himself appeared under the form of the same reptile, and completed the work of seduction. They acknowledged him instead of Ormuzd as the creator of everything good; and the consequence was, that they forfeited for ever the internal happiness for which they were destined. They killed beasts, and clothed themselves in their skins; they built houses, but paid not their debt of gratitude to the Deity. The evil demons thus obtained still more perfect power over their minds, and called forth envy, hatred, discord, and rebellion, which raged in the bosom of the families.—*Zenda-vesta*, Kleuker's *Ed.* ii. 217, 280, iii. 62, 84, 85.

It is unnecessary to point out the features of this legend which are parallel with the Mosaic narrative. It contains almost all the materials of the latter,—the remarkable tree, the serpent, the degradation and fall of man. It is, then, evident that all these traits are not specifically Mosaic; they belonged to the common traditional lore of the Asiatic nations; they cannot, therefore, be *essential* in the system of *Mosaic* theology; they serve to represent the ideas, but are not indispensable for them; they are the vehicle used to convey certain truths, but these truths might have been expressed in a thousand other shapes; the truths are unchangeable and necessary, the form is indifferent and accidental.

1088. And he gives the Chinese myth, p. 89:—

The Chinese also—have their age of virtue, when nature furnished abundant food to the happy men, who lived peacefully surrounded by the beasts, exercised virtue without the assistance of Science, and did not yet know what it meant to do good or evil. The physical desires were perfectly subordinate to the divine spirit in man, who had all heavenly, and no earthly, dispositions; disease and death never approached him; but partly an undue thirst for knowledge, partly increasing sensuality, and the seduction of women, were his perdition: all moderation was lost; passion and lust ruled in the human mind; the war with

the animals began; and all nature stood inimically arrayed against him.

1089. So, again, KALISCH writes of the Garden of Eden, p. 108:—

The Paradise is no exclusive feature of the early history of the Hebrews. Most of the ancient nations have similar narratives about a happy abode, which care does not approach, and which reechoes with the sounds of the purest bliss. The *Greeks* believed that, at an immense distance beyond the Pillars of Hercules, on the borders of the Earth, were the Islands of the Blessed, the Elysium, abounding in every charm of life, and the Garden of the Hesperides, with their golden apples, guarded by an ever-watchful serpent (Ladon). But still more analogous is the legend of the *Hindus*, that, in the sacred mountain Mern, which is perpetually clothed in the golden rays of the Sun, and whose lofty summit reaches into heaven, no sinful man can exist,—that it is guarded by dreadful dragons,—that it is adorned with many celestial plants and trees, and is *watered by four rivers*, which thence separate and flow to the four chief directions. Equally striking is the resemblance to the belief of the *Persians*, who suppose that a region of bliss and delight, the town Eriene Vedsho, or *Heden*, more beautiful than all the rest of the world, traversed by a mighty river, was the original abode of the first men, before they were tempted by Ahriman, in the shape of a serpent, to partake of the wonderful fruit of the forbidden tree *Hôm*.

The 'tree of life' has analogies in the 'king of trees,' *Hôm*, which the Persians believed to grow at the spring Ardechsur, issuing from the throne of Ormuzd, and in the tall *Pilpel* of the Indians, to which was also ascribed the power of securing immortality and every other blessing. But the 'tree of knowledge' may be compared with the 'well of wisdom' in northern mythology, from which even the great God Odin drinks, and which gives knowledge even to the wise Mimer.

1090. DELITZSCH observes, p. 195:—

The cherubs appear here as guards of Paradise, just as in the Persian legend 99,999, i.e. innumerable, attendants of the Holy One keep watch against the attempts of Ahriman over the tree *Hôm*, which contains in itself the power of the resurrection. Much closer, however, lies the comparison of the winged lion-and-eagle-formed griffins, which watch the gold-caves of the Arimaspean metallic mountains, and of the sometimes more or less hawk-formed—sometimes only winged and otherwise man-formed—guardians, upon the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments. The resemblance of the symbols is surprisingly great; and the comparison of the King of Tyre, *Ez.* xviii. 14–16, to a protecting cherub with outspread wings, who, stationed on the holy mountain, 'walked up and down in the midst of the stones of fire,' justifies us in assuming such a connection. Its explanation lies in this, that the human race, when separating into peoples, took with them from their original home the idea of the cherub,

and fashioned it mythologically. But the fundamental traces have remained unchanged. For the occupation of the griffin is just as twofold as that of the Biblical cherub. They watch before the rock of gold, but also they draw the chariots of the gods, and carry gods upon their wings. (*ÆSCH. Prom. Vinc.*) So the cherubs keep watch over that which must not be approached; and the name is derived probably from *charab*, 'grab, grapple, grasp, gripe,' Sanscr. *grībh*, Pers. *girīsten*, Goth. *grifun*: comp. Gr. *γρῦψ*, meaning a being holding fast, and making what it holds unapproachable. But the cherubs also are described as carrying the glory of God, when He appears in the world, Ps. xviii.10, Ez. i.15, Eccles. xlix.8.

1091. KNOBEL observes, with respect to the doctrine of 'Original Sin,' p.41:

Upon this passage the doctrine of Original Sin is [mainly] grounded. According to it, the first pair found themselves at first in a state of perfection and had an original righteousness, or the divine image, to which also belonged—in a corporeal point of view, incorruptibility, health, freedom from pain, a temperate state of sensual impulses, and agreement thereof with reason and will, and, according to many, immortality also,—in a spiritual point of view, right knowledge of God and His Will, also of self and of things generally, and the power to love God, to fulfil His Commands, and to act in entire agreement with Him. The first pair, however, allowed themselves to be misled by the Devil to the transgression of the Divine Command, and fell into sin: they lost the divine image, and experienced a corruption of their whole nature, and of all their powers, *viz.* death, and other bodily evils, darkening of the spirit and ignorance of God, inability to fear and love God and to do His Commands, general incapacity of the will for good, and supremacy of the evil desires. This corruption descended by inheritance through natural procreation to all the posterity of Adam.

As this doctrine, however, is framed, it finds very little support in the narrative before us, independently altogether of the question whether it is historically true.

(i) The writer does not teach any original state of perfection. As to the corporeal state he is silent, and simply with respect to the point of immortality betrays his view to this effect, that man was created originally *mortal*, and only through partaking of the tree of life, which, however, never took place, might have become immortal, ii.17, iii.19,22. Instead of perfect knowledge, he rather ascribes the opposite to the first pair, *viz.* the not knowing good and evil, *i.e.* the want of moral perception, and, in fact, to such an extent, that they did not perceive at all that going naked was unbecoming, and that clothing was proper, ii.25. This want made them *unlike* God, iii.22, and was certainly not regarded by the narrator as part of the 'divine image.' Of the Will of God they knew simply the command forbidding them to eat of the tree of knowledge, ii.17; at all events, the narrative tells us of no other. Just as little does the writer ascribe to the first pair a

moral perfection. He represents them rather as finding themselves in a state of moral indifference, and could not do otherwise, since he denies to them moral perception,—exactly that, through which all morality and immorality is conditioned. Only they did not transgress the above-named command before the temptation; more than this is not to be seen in the narrative.

(ii) The writer relates nothing about the Devil, and the temptation of Eve through him, but speaks only of a *serpent*, iii.1,15.

(iii) He does not teach that a *general corruption* was introduced through the Fall. With reference to the body, he represents only in the case of Eve something of that kind, iii.16, without, however, mentioning it as a corruption. On the contrary, in the case of Adam, whom he makes merely to be punished with the labours of agriculture, he is silent about any such change, and has certainly not assumed any corruption of the sensitive nature of man, and especially not that the latter then first became mortal through the Fall. In an intellectual point of view, he maintains not a *loss* and *retrogression*, but a *gain* and *advance*, of the first pair, since he makes them through the transgression attain a moral perception, and thereby become like unto God, iii.22. How that can be a loss of the divine image, it is impossible to see. In a moral point of view, he relates only that Adam and Eve had transgressed the divine command, had committed a sin, and introduced evil into human life. But he does not teach that, through one single transgression, the moral nature of man was entirely changed and corrupted, and man has lost all capability for good.

(iv) He knows still less of a propagation of the moral corruption through procreation, but has manifestly assumed a growing increase of evil through the free inclination of man: at least, that terrible idea cannot be shown to exist in his story. He sets forth the direction given to Cain to master sin, iv.7, and assumes, therefore, the possibility, and, consequently, the capability also, for good, as existing with him.

(v) He knows nothing at all of the 'divine image' in man, which only the Elohist has, and says, therefore, nothing about the possession or the loss of it.

1092. The truth is, that the expression 'divine image,' as used in dogmatic theology, is used in a totally different sense from that in which the words are employed in G.i.26,27, where it seems to mean chiefly the possession by man of a more noble and divine form, and especially of superior intelligence, and the power of reason and conscience:—

'He gave him mind,—the lordliest Proportions,—and, above the rest, Dominion in the head and breast.'

And the doctrine, which is above stated, cannot be derived, by any process of just interpretation, from the

narrative in G. ii. 16-iii. 24, though other passages of Scripture no doubt may be adduced in support of it, *e.g.* Rom. v. 12, 1 Cor. xv. 21, 22. The writer in Genesis rather appears to have considered that he was giving an account of the subjection of the human race to *physical* evil: whereas St. PAUL represents the death of the human race in Adam as involving that tendency to *moral* evil, that 'lusting of the flesh against the spirit,' that 'bodily death,' which he felt in himself, and perceived to be common to all mankind.

1093. It is sufficient merely to mention in this place the horrible doctrine of St. AUGUSTINE, upon the dogma of 'Original Sin,' with reference to which Bishop WARSON writes as follows, *Apolo- gies*, &c. p. 463:—

'Hold thou most firmly, nor do thou in any respect doubt, that infants, whether in their mothers' wombs they begin to live and there die, or when, after their mothers have given birth to them, they pass from this life without the sacrament of holy baptism, will be punished with the everlasting punishment of eternal fire.' Parent of universal good! Merciful Father of the human race! How hath the benignity of Thy nature been misrepresented! How hath the Gospel of Thy Son been misinterpreted by the burning zeal of presumptuous man! I mean not on this occasion to enter into the various questions, which learned men have too minutely discussed, concerning the lapse of our first parents' original rectitude, and subsequent deprivation of human nature. I simply mean to say that a proposition, which asserts that infants dying in the womb will be tormented in everlasting fire because of Adam's transgression, is a proposition so entirely subversive of all our natural notions of the justice and mercy of the Supreme Being, that it cannot be admitted unless a passage in Scripture could be produced, in which it is clearly and in so many words revealed. And I am certain that no such passage can be produced.

CHAPTER XIII.

GEN. IV. 1-V. 32.

1094. G. iv. 2.

'Abel was a keeper of sheep.'

DELITZSCH observes, p. 199:—

The small domestic cattle, sheep and goats, were kept in this earliest extra-paradisaical time, on account of their woolly skin, not at all to be used as food, although, perhaps, also for the sake of their milk, since milk is certainly an animal nutriment, and, therefore, was not used in paradise, but yet is not obtained through the destruction of animal life. . . . The calling of each brother was directed

towards food,—that of Abel especially towards that covering of their sinful nakedness, which God's own initiation had consecrated.

It is obvious, however, that animals must have been *slain*, if their hides were used for covering,—unless, indeed, Adam and Eve were taught the art of weaving the wool into cloth, which the statement in iii. 21, 'Jehovah-Elohim made coverings of skin,' is very far from implying. It may be supposed that they used the skins of animals killed for sacrifices. But we have seen (1017) that, even in the use of vegetable food, there is necessarily infinite destruction of animal life.

1095. G. iv. 14.

'Every one that findeth me shall slay me.'

There seems to be an inconsistency here in the story. For, at this time, the only man upon the face of the earth was Adam—rather, the only *male* person; for Seth was not born till after this, v. 25, and, during the whole time which had elapsed since the birth of Cain and Abel, Eve had borne no son, though she may be supposed to have had daughters, among whom may be reckoned Cain's wife, v. 17. Hence Cain would hardly have expected to find people ready to kill him.

1096. DELITZSCH writes, p. 205:—

Eden (*i.e.* the land of Eden) was certainly at this time the exclusive dwelling-place of the young humanity. The writer seems here to have forgotten himself. But not so: for, whereas Cain fears that beyond Eden he shall be recognised as the well-known murderer, the story explains this by saying that there was only one human family, the family of Adam, and no other family standing out of connection with it, [so that *every* person, whom he might hereafter chance to encounter anywhere, would be a relative of the murdered Abel.] It is manifestly the avenging-of-blood, which Cain fears, when his father's family shall spread itself: for, that murder is to be punished through the death of the murderer, is a principle of justice written in every human breast; and the circumstance, that Cain already sees the earth full of avengers, is one quite usual with the murderer, who feels himself everywhere surrounded and tormented by avenging spirits.

1097. G. iv. 17.

'And he (Cain) was building a city.'

DELITZSCH notes, p. 209:—

That already a *city* comes upon the scene seems absurd to those, who choose to imagine to themselves the advance of human cultivation, as no other than a slow laborious pro-

gress, out of an entirely, or partially, animal state of existence. But,—leaving out of consideration the fact that the introduction of settled dwelling-places and buildings is lost in the legends of all nations, far back in the mythical primal age, beyond the reach of memory,—yet, when this Cainite town arose, already centuries may have elapsed since the origin of the human race, and 'city' means, at first, nothing more than an enclosure with fixed dwellings,—in opposition to mere shepherds' tents, standing near each other [like huts in a Zulu kraal], and, further, changing from place to place. . . It must appear much more strange that Cain, who, according to God's judgment, was to be 'a fugitive and a vagabond,' settles himself down so firmly. He has in this way set himself against the divine curse, in order to feel it inwardly so much the more, as outwardly he seems to have overcome it.

1098. G. iv. 17, 18.

There is a considerable resemblance between the descendants of Cain, as given in these verses, and those of Seth in G. v. Thus 'Enoch' and 'Lamech' are found in both genealogies; and in *this* we have Kain, Irad, Methusael, in *that* we have Kenan, Jered, Methuselah; also *Enosh* and *Adam* are both names for 'man.' From this BUTTMANN infers that these are two different versions of the same tradition.

1099. The argument is ingenious and plausible. HÄVERNICK, p. 109, considers that the circumstance of the similarity of the two lists of names—

finds its most appropriate explanation in the small number of names, that were in use in the old world (!).

It is possible that there may be here two different genealogies, or two different forms of the same genealogy. KNOBEL, *Gen.* p. 54, considers that the later form may, however, be merely an imitation of the Elohistie genealogy in chap. v, the names being transferred from the Sethite to the Cainite list, with some modifications.

1100. G. iv. 20-22.

Here the first introduction of *cattle-keeping, music, and smithery* is ascribed to the descendants of Cain. With respect to these inventions, and especially that of *music*, DELITZSCH observes, p. 212:—

How comes the race of Cain to have the honour of making such important advances in civilisation? For this reason, that the race of the Promise has fallen out with the world, while the race of the Curse is on good terms with it,—for this reason, that the one is in-

fluenced from within, and the other from without,—for this reason, that the one has in God its heart's treasure, the home of its thoughts, and the object of its every aim and act, while the other lives in the sensual and visible, and from this seeks to enrich, adorn, and establish, its poor, barren, restless life. All human history confirms the observation, to which the beginning of this primary history leads us, that culture becomes more extended and refined in the great bulk of men, just in proportion as estrangement from God increases. The Arts do not even now belie the root of the Curse, out of which they have sprung (!). There lies a magical attraction in every Art and Science, which seeks to draw back the heart from simplicity in God, and to ensnare it in the bonds of Nature, the Flesh, the life of this world. There is also in all Music, not only an unspiritualised principle still remaining, of material *natural* origin, but also a Cainite element, of impure *sensual* origin, which makes it at once the most seemingly innocent, but, at the same time, most dangerously seductive, Art. But, although sprung from the soil of man's corrupt nature, the Arts have, however, been taken into the service of Holiness, because the ungodliness, which clings to them is, after all, common to all on this side the grave, &c.

1101. G. iv. 23, 24.

'Adah and Zillah, hear my voice!
Wives of Lamech, give ear to my speech!
For I have slain a man for my wound,
And a youth for my hurt.
For Cain shall be avenged seven-times,
And Lamech seventy-times seven-times!'

This song may have been current in the popular legends at the time when the Jehovist wrote. It was then comparatively old, as it would be, for instance, if it referred to events a century old. It seems to express the idea that to kill in self-defence was lawful. If Cain, who had killed one who had done him no harm, was to be protected, how much more Lamech, who had only slain an enemy, on account of a 'wound' he had received from him?

1102. In this old song, however, DELITZSCH finds a deep meaning, p. 215:

We must not forget that Lamech did not speak Hebrew, so that this song has passed over from its original form into Hebrew through a process of tradition (!) It is not less a true mirror of the genesis of poetry. If we look only at the contents of the song, how deeply significant is this conclusion of the Cainite primeval history! There we find expressed that Titanic pride, of which the Scripture says that 'its power is its god,' Hab. i. 11. Lamech looks at the first arms which his son forges; his song is the song of triumph at the invention of the sword. . . Here is the genesis of the most spiritual of all Arts, Poetry. Not the glorifying of God, but the glorifying of murderous arms, self-

deification, deification of the ungodly, was its origin. It was conceived and born in sin. Its birthplace is not Heaven, and not Paradise, but the house of Lamech. It needed to be regenerated, in order to be pleasing to God. But it is just the same with this regeneration as with that of man: he becomes a new person, yet retains still the old nature. So has Sacred Poetry certainly a new heart, directed towards God; but its bodily form is and remains entangled in vanity, weakness, want of clearness, want of harmony of everything earthly (!) It is coupled, if not with sinful worldliness, yet with the curse-stricken character of things on this side of the grave, and still awaits, though sanctified, its glorification.

1103. DELITZSCH, it will be seen, to make out his theory of the 'curse-stricken' nature of Poetry, *assumes*—

(i) that this little song was the first piece of poetry ever written,—

(ii) that it has connection with the forging of the first sword.

Such, however, is the deadly Manicheism which is taught by many, even in this day, as Christianity! It is that which seeks to turn this blessed world in which we live, and in which God dwells, with all its light and beauty and glory, into a dark gloomy prison-house, and which represents the very excellencies of our nature, its divine faculties, its God-given capabilities, its infinite strivings after improvement and progress, as standing in close connection with the Curse, and its manifold developments of genius, in all kinds of Arts and Sciences, as so many sources of danger and death, instead of the healthy and happy manifestations of life.

1104. VON BOHLEN, p. 82, supposes that the people of Eastern Asia generally, and especially of India, are referred to in this story:—

In the narrative of the Hebrew compiler we find an acknowledgment, that the Asiatic nations to the east of Palestine were of greater antiquity than the Jews, [Cain was the *first-born*, v. 1.]—that they did not worship Jehovah, ['from Thy Face I shall be hid,' v. 14.]—and Cain went out from the face of Jehovah, v. 16]—that they followed agricultural pursuits at an earlier period than the Hebrew nation, ['Jabal was the father of all such as dwell in tents and among cattle,' v. 20.] and inhabited towns, ['Cain was building a city,' v. 17.] and became civilised, [Jubal invented 'the lute and the flute,' v. 22, Tubal-Cain wrought in 'brass and iron,' v. 22, Lamech composed a song, v. 23.]—but that, with all this, they must be regarded in the light of proscribed outlaws, ['fugitive and

vagabond,' v. 12, 14.] . . . We may notice the circumstances, that the Zend religion decidedly enjoins and favours agriculture, [the occupation of Cain, v. 2.]—this employment appearing to be, according to its tenets, a species of divine service. [The very name 'Aryan' is derived from *Ar*, 'to plough.'] . . . On the other hand, a pastoral life, [such as that of Abel, v. 2.] which in Palestine never wholly disappeared, was considered by the Hebrew narrator as protected and consecrated by the blessing of Jehovah. Agriculture, too, according to the same writer, had been imposed as a *punishment* on man, iii. 17-19; and it was here degraded, from the same feeling of antipathy to that employment, which the Hebrew derived from his nomad origin, and which he still continued to manifest, long after he had been obliged, by his settled position in Palestine, to devote himself to the cultivation of the soil, and to enact agrarian laws. Agriculturists were always esteemed an inferior class to shepherds among the Israelites; kings kept their flocks; men of superior attainments arose from pastoral life.

1105. He suggests also, p. 90:—

Nod lay eastward of Eden: and if the compiler (as often happens in Arabic with foreign names) was deceived by imagining that there was a Semitic article in *Hind*, (Heb. and Arab. for *India*, for which *Hoddu*=*Hondu*, stands in Esth. i. 1.) we should in that case, of course, with J. D. MICHAELIS, see here an expression for India in the widest meaning. . . We are reminded by the name of Cain's city, (*Enoch*) *Khānoch*, v. 17, of the very ancient commercial city of *Chanoge*, Arab. *Khanug*, in Northern India, celebrated in the early epics of the Hindoos, and called by the ancients Canogyza, of which the narrator might have heard.

For our purpose, of course, no stress can be laid upon the above suggestion, which at the best cannot be raised beyond a doubtful probability. It seems, however, very possible that India, with its early progress in civilisation and the arts, may be here referred to, since in Solomon's time,—the age in which it is most likely that this Jehovistic chapter was written,—there was probably considerable intercourse with the East, 1 K. x. 11; and thus India, and even its great commercial town, 'Chanoge,' may have become known to the Israelites.

1106. KNOBEL, p. 53, considers that the nations referred to are rather the northern and north-eastern peoples of Asia, the Hunnish tribes of Mongolian origin, to whom belonged the original inhabitants of Thibet and Higher India, as well as the Chinese, Japanese, &c. The restless Tartar tribes would thus correspond to the

description 'fugitive and vagabond,' while the very ancient settlement and civilisation of China would explain the notice of inventions in the arts, &c. All these tribes, being marked with a peculiar physiognomy, were quite distinguished, not only from all the Shemitic tribes, but from the supposed kindred of the latter, the descendants of Ham and Japheth. And if the words in iv.15 be translated, 'And Jehovah set a mark on Cain,' and explained, as they are by many interpreters, to imply some peculiar mark set on his person, there might be a reference to the strangely-marked features of all the people of this race.

1107. No doubt there is, as KNOBEL observes, an important objection to any explanation of this kind, viz. that, according to the story, the Cainites must have been altogether swept away by the Deluge, and therefore it cannot be supposed that they represent nations living after that event. But he adds, p.54:—

It cannot be doubted, however, that the writer was led to give the Table of Cainite genealogy through his knowledge of the post-diluvian Eastern-Asiatics, and follows this knowledge in the separate details about the Cainites. There exists, then, an inconsistency, if, knowing of post-diluvian Cainites, he yet makes all the Cainites perish through the flood. Such mistakes, however, are not uncommon with him [as in the notice of Cain's fear of being killed, v.14, his building a city, v.17, when there was as yet no population]. This inconsistency might have been avoided, if he had mentioned the Cainites, in case he did not wish to omit them, among the post-diluvian men; but then he would have fallen into another error, since he must have referred them back to Noah and his sons, while he yet knew that the descendants of Noah, and those of Seth generally, were confined to the West-Asiatic nations.

1108. The great longevity of ancient days, beyond the reach of authentic history, is common to the traditions of all nations.

DION. SIC. l.26, HEROD. iii.23, PLIN. *Hist. Nat.* vii.48, speak of persons who have lived a thousand years. According to the Lamaic creed, the first man lived 60,000 years; and the Indian traditions speak of four epochs, during which the duration of human life sank, successively, from 400 to 300, 200, 100 years. . . . There are ten Patriarchs reckoned before the Flood. So the Hindus believed in ten great saints, the offspring of Manu, and in ten different personifications of Vishnu; the Egyptians knew ten mighty heroes, the

Chaldeans ten kings before the Flood, the Assyrians ten kings from Ham to Ninyas, and as many from Japhet to Aram; and the Book of Enoch enumerates ten periods, each comprising seven generations, from Adam to the Messiah. KALISCH, *Gen.* p.156,160.

So PLATO enumerates ten sons of Neptune, as the rulers of his imaginary Island of Atlantis, submerged by the Deluge.

1109. DELITZSCH justly observes, p. 221, that the notion that these great ages can be reduced to moderate dimensions, by supposing that a year meant a month, brings nonsense instead of meaning into the story; for, in that case, Mahalaleel and Enoch would have each had a son when only (65 months =) $5\frac{1}{2}$ years old. Besides which, the notices of Noah's age in the account of the Deluge, vii.11, viii.13, refer incontestably to common years, as appears from the mention of *second, seventh, tenth, first months*, vii.11, viii.4,5,13,14.

1110. As soon, however, as we come down in the Bible to the account of really historical times, we see no more of these extraordinary ages. But the average extreme duration of human life,—which is described as lying between 1000 and 700 years from Adam to Noah, between 600 and 200 years from Noah to Abraham, and between 200 and 100 years from Abraham to Moses and Joshua,—sinks down at last to 'threescore-years-and-ten,' Ps.xc.10, even as now.

1111. G.v.3.

'And he (Adam) begat in his likeness after his image, and called his name Seth.'

KNOBEL observes, p.71:—

This passage teaches—

(i) That the Elohist, also, assumed only one human pair, which is not distinctly mentioned in 1.26;

(ii) That Seth was [according to this writer] an image of God; for the writer first marks distinctly that man had been created after God's image, and then adds that he begat in his likeness after his image, i.e. a being altogether like himself.

The Elohist, in fact, knows nothing of the account of the Fall in G.iii, and, therefore, cannot mean to say, in the passage before us, as some suppose, that Adam begat a son in his own fallen image. That doctrine cannot be based on this passage of Scripture, rightly interpreted according to the meaning of its author.

1112. G.v.24.

'And Enoch walked with Elohim, and he was not, for Elohim took him.'

KNOBEL here notes, p.72 :—

With Enoch may be well compared the Phrygian King Annakus or Nannakus, who is said to have lived before the great Flood, and whose name was proverbial for very ancient things, as well as for great calamities. According to the story, it was predicted in the time of Annakus, (who was more than 300 years old, and could prophesy,) that after his death all should be destroyed, by reason of which the Phrygians were very sorrowful. Nannakus saw the coming Flood beforehand, assembled all into the Temple, and offered mournful intercessions.

1113. In Part V we shall discuss the remainder of the First Eleven Chapters of Genesis, including the consideration of the physical, ethnological, and philological questions, which are raised by the Scriptural accounts of the Flood, the Dispersion of Nations, the Tower of Babel, &c. We shall conclude the present Part by giving some account of the remarkable apocryphal 'Book of Enoch,' which is a work of great interest and significance in relation to our present inquiries.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE BOOK OF ENOCH.

1114. IN the 'General Epistle of JUDE,' v.14,15, we find the following well-known reference to the 'Book of Enoch':—

'And Enoch also, the seventh from Adam, prophesied of these, saying, Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of His Saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard [speeches] which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him.'

It seems plain that the author of this Canonical Epistle believed that the 'Book of Enoch,' in which the above passage occurs as chap.ii, was actually written by 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam,' or, at least, contained the record of his prophecies, just as confidently as he and others of his time, e.g. St. PAUL, believed that the Pentateuch was either actually the work of Moses, or, at all events, contained a true record of his doings.

1115. It may be said, indeed, that the words are really Enoch's, handed down

by tradition from the years beyond the Flood, and quoted by St. Jude from this tradition, and not from the 'Book of Enoch.' But it is unnecessary to reply to such an extravagant supposition, more especially when we consider the influence, which this 'Book' undeniably had upon the minds of other writers of the New Testament, as will be seen presently.

1116. Yet there is no doubt that the 'Book of Enoch' is a fiction; and, according to Archbishop LAURENCE, (*Book of Enoch, Prel. Diss. p.xliv*), it was composed *within about fifty years immediately preceding the birth of Christ*:—

It may, perhaps, be remarked as a singularity, that a book, composed at less than one hundred—perhaps, at less than fifty—years before St. Jude's Epistle was written, should in so short a space of time have so far imposed upon the public, as to be reputed by any the genuine production of the Patriarch Enoch.

And he adds in a note,—

The Epistle of St. JUDE is generally supposed to have been written about A.D. 70. If, then, we place the composition of the Book of Enoch in the eighth year of Herod, that is, thirty years before Christ, its date will precede that of the Epistle by an exact century.

Many excellent critics, however, maintain that the internal evidence of the Epistle of St. Jude makes it nearly—if not quite—certain, that it was not written till the middle of the Second Century at the earliest.

1117. But the facts connected with the 'Book of Enoch' are of so great interest and importance, in relation to the present controversy as to the age and authorship of the Pentateuch, that we must dwell more at length upon them,—more especially as they will, probably, not be familiarly known to many readers. It will be observed that three points are at once determined by the manner in which this book is quoted,—as being as authentic and authoritative as any other part of Holy Scripture,—in this Canonical Epistle, which is recognised in the Church of England as having been written by one of the Apostles.

1118. First, it appears that a spurious book like this could, even in so late and advanced an age, acquire among the

Jews in a very short time,—within, perhaps, fifty, or, at most, a hundred and eighty years,—the reputation of a veritable authentic document, really emanating from the antediluvian Patriarch, and either written originally by his own hand, or, at least, handed down by tradition from those who lived before the Deluge. In the face of this fact, is there any reason to doubt that the Pentateuch also, though not written by Moses, may yet have been received by the Jews, in the dark and troubled times of the Captivity, as being really and truly the work of the Great Law-giver, and have been implicitly believed to be such by those who lived in yet later days?

1119. Secondly, it is plain that, if St. JUDE was the writer of this Epistle, even an Apostle could be mistaken in such a matter, and could actually use, as a powerful argument, a quotation from the prophecies of 'Enoch, the seventh from Adam.' Is there any reason why the same, or any other Apostle, as St. Paul, should not be equally in error in quoting words, as words of Moses, which had never been written by him?

1120. Thirdly, on the other hand, if St. JUDE was *not* the author of the Epistle, it would follow that a book (that ascribed to St. Jude) received in the Church as Canonical, could be regarded also as Apostolical, under a mistaken opinion as to its authorship, and, therefore, that the fact of other books (as the Books of the Pentateuch) having been received as Canonical, and ascribed to a certain author (as MOSES), is no guarantee of their having been really written by him.

1121. The following extract from KALISCH, *Gen. p. 165*, will give the reader some idea of the nature and general contents of the Book of Enoch:

The Book of Enoch insists, with the earnestness of the old Prophets, upon the renewal and restoration of the pure Biblical faith; it combats with equal energy against the corruptions of Rabbinical interpretation and the inroads of Greek philosophy, against superstition and paganism. The author deduces all his truths from no other source but the written holy books, and rejects traditional exaggerations and embellishments. He gives enthusiastic descriptions of the world of

angels; he delineates their respective rank and glory; he introduces men into the abode of these pure spirits, and elevates them to their light, and peace, and wisdom. He furnishes the most elaborate and most detailed descriptions of the future life in such completeness, that no later time has been able to enlarge them. He gives a clear picture of the Sheol, its different divisions, and the preliminary judgment there held,—of the hell (gehenna) where the wicked are doomed to receive their punishment,—of the place where the fallen angels and contumacious powers of nature are fettered. He describes in full outlines the resurrection of the dead, and the Messianic judgment over the dead and living. But one of the most remarkable features of the Book of Enoch is its very elaborate and clear description of the person and the times of the Messiah. It does not only comprise the scattered allusions of the O.T. in one grand picture of unspeakable bliss, unalloyed virtue, and unlimited knowledge; it represents the Messiah, not only as the King, but as the Judge of the world, who has the decision over everything on earth and in heaven. In the Messiah is the 'Son of Man, who possesses righteousness, since the God of all spirits has elected him, and since he has conquered all by righteousness in eternity.' But he is also the 'Son of God,' the Elected One, the Prince of Righteousness; he is gifted with that wisdom, which knows all secret things; the Spirit in all its fulness is poured out on him; his glory lasts to all eternity; he shares the throne of God's Majesty; kings and princes will worship him, and will invoke his mercy; he pre-existed before all time; 'before the sun and the signs were made, and the stars of heaven were created, his name was already proclaimed before the Lord of all spirits'; 'before the creation of the world he was elected'; and although still unknown to the children of the world, he is already revealed to the pious by prophecy, and is praised by the angels in heaven. Even the dogma of the Trinity is implied in the book. It is formed by the Lord of the spirits, the Elected One, and the Divine Power: they partake both of the name and of the omnipotence of God.

1122. Upon the latter point, the recognition of a Trinity in the Book of Enoch, Archbp. LAURENCE writes as follows, *Book of Enoch, p. lii*:—

Neither is allusion thus only made to the Elect One or the Messiah, but also to another Divine Person or Power, both of whom, under the joint denomination of *the Lords*, are stated to have been 'over the water,'—that is, as I conceive, over the fluid mass of unformed matter,—at the period of Creation. 'He (the Elect One),' it is stated, 'shall call to every power of the heavens, to all the holy above, and to the power of God. The Cherubim, the Seraphim, and the Ophanim, *all the angels of power, and all the angels of the Lords*,—viz. of the *Elect One*, and of the *Other Power*, who was upon earth over the water on that day,—shall raise their united voice &c.' In this passage, an obvious reference, I conceive,

occurs to the first verse of Genesis, in which it is said, 'the Spirit of God moved on the face of the waters.' As, therefore, the more full description of the Son of Man here given may be considered as the Jewish comment of the day upon the vision of Daniel, so also, I apprehend, must the last quoted allusion to the Book of Genesis be considered as a comment of the same nature upon that account of Moses, which describes the commencement of Creation. Here, then, we have not merely the declaration of a *Plurality*, but that of a precise and distinct *Trinity*, of persons, under the supreme appellation of *God and Lords*; the *Lords* are denominated the *Elect One*, and the *Other* (divine) *Power*, who is represented as engaged in the formation of the world on that day, that is, on the day of Creation. And it should be added that upon [each of] these a particular class of angels is mentioned as appropriately attendant.

And again he writes, *p.lvi* :—

Here there is nothing cabballistical; here there is no allegory, but a plain and clear, though slight, allusion to a doctrine, which, had it not formed a part of the popular creed at the time, would scarcely have been intelligible. *Three Lords* are enumerated, the Lord of spirits, the Lord the Elect One, and the Lord the Other Power,—an enumeration which evidently implies the acknowledgment of three distinct Persons, participating in the name and in the power of the Godhead.

1123. In *En.lxxi.18,19*, we read as follows :—

'At that period the day is longer than the night, being twice as long as the night, and becomes twelve parts; but the night is shortened, and becomes six parts.'

From this it would seem that, at the place where the author lived, or, perhaps, where he supposes Enoch to have lived, the longest day was twice as long as the night, *i.e.* was *sixteen* hours long; and from this it may be inferred that it was a place in about 45° to 50° North Lat., and, consequently, very far to the north of Palestine (31°–33½°). Archbishop LAURENCE supposes that he may have been—

one of the tribes which Shalmaneser carried away, and 'placed in Halah and Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the *Medes*', 2K.xvii.6, and who never returned from captivity.

He adds, *p.xlvii* :—

Composed, therefore, in the assumed name and character of Enoch, and having been brought into Judea from a distant country, it could not have been well known or quoted under any other title than that of the Book of Enoch; and although the generality must, from its incongruities, have deemed its contents apocryphal, yet might there have been some who, deceived by its external evidence and pretensions, ignorantly esteemed it to be

the genuine production of the Patriarch himself, [as plainly did the writer of Jude 14,15.]

1124. It may be mentioned, as a fact of interest with reference to our present discussion, that the numerous names of angels which occur in this book, are in very many instances compounded with 'Elohim' or 'El', as *Urakabameel*, *Akibeel*, *Tamiel*, *Ramuel*, *Danel*, *Azkeel*, *Asael*, *Samsaveel*, *Ertael*, *Turel*, *Yomyael*, *En.vii.9*, (names of the 'pre-fects' of the 'two hundred angels,' who took wives of the daughters of men, *G.vi.1,2*,)—but none, apparently, are compounded with *Jehovah*.

1125. *KALISCH* adds the following information (condensed from Archbp. LAURENCE) as to the fortunes of the book, *p.166* :—

We may add, with regard to the history of this extraordinary book, that, when it appeared, it was evidently received and read with eager interest,—that it was soon translated into Greek, and from this language into the Ethiopian dialect,—that most of the Fathers of the Church, down to the time of AUGUSTINE and JEROME, used and quoted it,—that, however, from this period, it fell into almost entire oblivion. . . The MS., which AUGUSTUS MAR deposited in the library of the Vatican, remained unnoticed. But the celebrated traveller JAMES BRUCE brought, in 1773, three copies of the Ethiopian version to Europe; and, since this time, translations and valuable commentaries have been published. . . This remarkable apocryphal production, which, if we are not mistaken, will one day be employed as a most important witness in the history of religious dogmas, deserves the most careful study; and it is accessible to the English reader in the editions of LAURENCE, whose interesting 'Preliminary Dissertation' commands especial attention.

1126. It would appear—not only from its being quoted in the Epistle of St. Jude, but from the very many passages of the N.T., which so strikingly resemble it in language and imagery—that the Book of Enoch must have exerted considerable influence upon the minds of devout persons in the first age of Christianity, and must have helped to fashion many of the ideas which prevailed at that time, especially as regards the popular conceptions about Hell, and the endless torment of the wicked. We shall here produce, from the translation of Archbishop LAURENCE,—which, though in some respects defective, is sufficiently accurate for our present purpose,—a series of passages

out of the Book itself, which closely correspond with many familiar passages of the N.T. writers. They will be found also to illustrate many notices in the first chapters of Genesis.

(i) En.ii, 'Behold, He comes with ten thousands of His saints, to execute judgment upon them, and destroy the wicked, and reprove all the carnal for everything which the sinful and ungodly have done and committed against Him.'

Comp. Jude 14,15, 'Behold, the Lord cometh with ten thousands of His saints, to execute judgment upon all, and to convince all that are ungodly among them, of all their ungodly deeds which they have ungodly committed, and of all their hard [speeches], which ungodly sinners have spoken against Him.'

(ii) En.vi.9, 'The elect shall possess light joy, and peace, and they shall inherit the earth.'

Comp. Matt.v.5, 'Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth': but *comp.* also, Ps.xxv.13, xxxvii.9,11,22, &c.

(iii) En.ix.3, 'Then they said to their Lord the King: Thou art Lord of lords, God of gods, King of kings. The throne of Thy glory is for ever and ever, and for ever and ever is thy name sanctified and glorified. Thou art blessed and glorified. Thou hast made all things; Thou possessest power over all things; and all things are open and manifest before Thee. Thou beholdest all things, and nothing can be concealed from Thee.'

En.lxxxiii.2-4, 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the King, great and powerful in Thy greatness, Lord of all the creatures of heaven, King of kings, God of the whole world, whose reign, whose kingdom, and whose majesty endure for ever and ever. From generation to generation shall Thy dominion exist. All the heavens are Thy throne for ever, and all the earth Thy footstool for ever and ever. For Thou hast made them, and Thou reignest over all. No act whatever exceeds Thy power. With Thee wisdom is unchangeable, nor from Thy throne and presence is it ever averted. Thou knowest all things, seest and hearest them; nor is anything concealed from Thee.'

Comp. Heb.iv.13, 'Neither is there any creature, that is not manifest in His sight: but all things are naked and opened unto the eyes of Him with whom we have to do.'

Rev.iv.11, 'Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for Thou hast created all things, and for Thy pleasure they are, and were created.'

Rev.xv.3, 'Great and marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; just and true are Thy ways, Thou King of Saints. Who shall not fear Thee, O Lord, and glorify thy name? for Thou only art holy; for all nations shall come and worship before Thee; for Thy judgments are made manifest.'

Rev.xvii.14, xix.16, 'King of kings and Lord of lords.'

(iv) En.x.15,16, 'To Michael, also, the Lord said, Go, and announce his crime to Samyaza and to the others who are with him, who have been associated with women. . . . Bind them for seventy generations underneath the

earth, even to the day of judgment and of consummation, until the judgment, which will last for ever, be completed. Then shall they be taken away into the lowest depths of the fire in torments, and in confinement shall they be shut up for ever.'

En.xii.5, 'Then He said to me, Enoch, scribe of righteousness, go, tell the watchers of heaven, who have deserted the lofty sky, and their holy everlasting station, who have been polluted with women, and have done as the sons of men do, by taking to themselves wives, and who have been greatly corrupted on the earth, that on the earth they shall never obtain peace and remission of sin.'

Comp. Jude 6, 'And the angels which kept not their first estate, but left their own habitation, He hath reserved in everlasting chains under darkness, unto the judgment of the Great Day.'

2 Pet.ii.4, 'God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment.'

[Thus the 'fall of the angels,' alluded to in Jude 6 and 2 Pet.ii.4, was not, it would seem, previous to the creation of man.]

Rev.xiv.4, 'These are they, which were not defiled with women, &c.'

Rev.xx.2, 'And he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil and Satan, and bound him a thousand years, &c.'

Rev.xx.10, 'And the devil, that deceived them, was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, . . . and shall be tormented, day and night, for ever.'

(v) En.xiv.17-24, 'Attentively I surveyed it, and saw that it contained an exalted throne . . . and there was the voice of the cherubim. From underneath this mighty throne rivers of flaming fire issued; to look upon it was impossible. One great in glory sat upon it, whose robe was brighter than the sun, and whiter than snow. No angel was capable of penetrating to view the Face of Him, the Glorious and the Effulgent; nor could any mortal behold Him. A fire was flaming around Him . . . so that not one of those who surrounded Him was capable of approaching Him, among the (myriads of myriads) ten thousand times ten thousand who were before Him. . . . Yet did not the sanctified, who were near Him, depart from Him, either by night or by day.'

En.xxxix.12, 'There my eyes beheld all who, without sleeping, stand before Him and bless Him, saying, Blessed be Thou, and Blessed be the Name of God for ever and for ever!'

Comp. Rev.iv.2, 'Behold a throne was set in heaven, and One sat on the throne, and He that sat was to look upon like a jasper and sardine stone.'

Rev.iv.8, 'And they rest not day and night, saying, Holy! Holy! Holy!'

Rev.v.11, 'And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne . . . and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands.'

Rev.vii.15, 'Therefore are they before the throne of God, and serve Him day and night in His temple.'

(vi) En.xxiv.9-11, 'And that tree of an agreeable smell, not one of a carnal odour . . . there shall be no power to touch until the period of the great judgment. When all shall be punished and consumed for ever, this shall be bestowed on the righteous and humble. The fruit of this tree shall be given to the elect. For life shall be planted towards the north in the holy place, towards the habitation of the everlasting King. Then shall they greatly rejoice and exult in the Holy One. The sweet odour shall enter into their bones; and they shall live a long life on the earth, as thy forefathers have lived, neither in their days shall sorrow, distress, trouble, and punishment afflict them. And I blessed the Lord of Glory, the everlasting King, because He has prepared this tree for the saints, formed it, and declared that He would give it to them.'

Comp. The 'tree of life,' G.ii.9, ii.22, 'Lord of glory,' James ii.1.

Rev.ii.7, 'To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the paradise of God.'

Rev.xxii.2, 'In the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month; and the leaves of the tree were for the healing of the nations.'

Rev.xxiii.14, 'Blessed are they that do His commandments, that they may have right to the tree of life.'

(vii) En.xxxi.2-5, 'From thence I passed on above the summits of those mountains to some distance eastwards, and went over the Erythraean sea. And when I was advanced far beyond it, I passed along above the angel Zateel, and arrived at the garden of righteousness. . . The tree of knowledge also was there, of which if any one eats, he becomes endowed with great wisdom. . . Then holy Raphael, an angel who was with me, said, This is the tree of knowledge, of which thy ancient father and thy aged mother ate, who were before thee; and who, obtaining knowledge, their eyes being opened, and knowing themselves to be naked, were expelled from the garden.'

Comp. the 'tree of knowledge of good and evil,' G.ii.iii.

(viii) En.xxxviii.2, 'Where will the habitation of sinners be, and where the place of rest for those who have rejected the Lord of spirits? It would have been better for them, if they had never been born.'

Comp. Matt.xxvi.24, 'It had been good for that man, if he had not been born.'

(ix) En.xi.1, 'After this I beheld thousands of thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand, and an infinite number of people, standing before the Lord of spirits.'

Comp. Rev.v.11, 'And I beheld, and I heard the voice of many angels round about the throne, . . . and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands.'

Rev.vii.9, 'After this I beheld, and lo! a great multitude, which no man could number, of all nations, and kindred, and people, and tongues, stood before the throne.'

(x) En.xlv.3-5, 'In that day shall the Elect

One sit upon a throne of glory, and shall choose their conditions and countless habitations, [comp. the 'many mansions,' St. John xiv.2,]—while their spirits within them shall be strengthened, when they behold my Elect One,—for those who have fled for protection to my holy and glorious Name. In that day I will cause my Elect One to dwell in the midst of them. I will change the face of the heaven: I will bless it and illuminate it for ever. I will also change the face of the earth: I will bless it, and cause those whom I have elected to dwell upon it.'

Comp. Matt.xxv.31-33, 'When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, and all the holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory, and before Him shall be gathered all nations, &c.'

2Pet.iii.13, 'Nevertheless, we, according to His promise, look for new heavens and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness.'

Rev.xxi.1, 'And I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away.'

(xi) En.xlvi.1-2, 'Then beheld I the Ancient of Days, whose head was like white wool, and with Him another, whose countenance resembled that of Man. His countenance was full of grace, like that of one of the holy angels. Then I enquired of one of the angels who went with me, and who showed me every secret thing concerning this Son of Man, who he was, whence he was, and why he accompanied the Ancient of Days. He answered and said unto me: This is the Son of Man, to whom righteousness belongs, with whom righteousness has dwelt, and who will reveal all the treasures of that which is concealed; for the Lord of spirits has chosen him, and his portion has surpassed all before the Lord of spirits in everlasting uprightness.'

Comp. Dan.vii.13, 'I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of Man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of Days, and they brought him near before Him.'

Rev.i.14, 'His head and His hairs were white like wool, as white as snow.'

Col.ii.3, 'In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.'

(xii) En.xlvii.1,2, 'In that day the prayer of the holy and the righteous, and the blood of the righteous, shall ascend from the earth into the presence of the Lord of spirits. In that day shall the holy ones assemble, who dwell above the heavens and with united voice petition, supplicate, praise, laud, and bless the name of the Lord of spirits, on account of the blood of the righteous which has been shed; that the prayer of the righteous may not be intermitted before the Lord of spirits, that for them He would execute judgment, and that His patience may not endure for ever.'

Comp. Rev.vi.9,10, 'I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony which they held. And they cried with a loud voice, saying, How long, O Lord, holy and true, dost Thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?'

(xiii) En.xlvii.3, 'At that time I beheld the

Ancient of Days, while He sat upon the throne of His glory, while the book of the living was opened in His presence, and while all the powers which were above the heavens stood around and before Him.'

En.i.1-5, 'In those days shall the earth deliver up from her womb, and hell deliver up from hers, that which it has received, and destruction shall restore that which it owes. He shall select the righteous and holy from among them; for the day of their salvation has approached. And in those days shall the Elect One sit upon his throne, while every secret of intellectual wisdom shall proceed from his mouth; for the Lord of spirits has gifted and glorified him. . . . And all the righteous shall become angels in heaven; their countenance shall be bright with joy, for in those days shall the Elect One be exalted. The earth shall rejoice, the righteous shall inhabit it, and the elect possess it.'

Comp. Rev.xx.11-13, 'And I saw a great white throne, and Him that sat on it, . . . and I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened, and another book was opened, which is the book of life, and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it, and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them.'

Luke xxi.28, 'Your redemption draweth nigh.'

Rom.xiii.11, 'Now is our salvation nearer than when we believed.'

Matt.xiii.43, 'Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father.'

(xiv) En.xlvii.4, 'Then were the hearts of the saints full of joy, because the consummation of righteousness was arrived, the supplication of the saints heard, and the blood of the righteous appreciated by the Lord of spirits.'

Comp. Rev.xviii.20, 'Rejoice over her, thou heaven, and ye holy apostles and prophets, for God hath avenged you on her.'

Rev.xix.1,2, 'I heard a great voice of much people in heaven, saying, Alleluia! Salvation and glory, and honour, and power, unto the Lord our God! For true and righteous are His judgments; for He . . . hath avenged the blood of His servants at her hand.'

(xv) En.xlviii.1-7, 'In that place I beheld a fountain of righteousness, which never failed, encircled by many springs of wisdom. Of these all the thirsty drank, and were filled with wisdom, having their habitation with the righteous, the elect, and the holy. In that hour was this Son of Man invoked before the Lord of spirits, and His Name in the presence of the Ancient of Days. Before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars of heaven were formed, his name was invoked in the presence of the Lord of spirits. A support shall he be for the righteous and the holy, to lean upon without falling; and he shall be the light of nations. He shall be the hope of those whose hearts are troubled. All who dwell on earth shall fall down and worship before him, shall bless and glorify him, and sing praises to the name of the Lord of spirits.

Therefore the Elect and the Concealed One existed in His presence, before the world was created and for ever. In His presence he existed, and has revealed to the saints and to the righteous the wisdom of the Lord of spirits; for he has preserved the lot of the righteous, because they have hated and rejected this world of iniquity, [comp. Gal.i.4, 'this present evil world,' 1John ii.15, 'love not the world,'] and have detested all its works and ways, in the name of the Lord of spirits. For in His Name shall they be preserved, and His Will shall be their life.'

Comp. Rev.vii.17, 'He shall lead them unto living fountains of waters.'

Rev.xxi.6, 'I will give unto him that is athirst of the fountain of the water of life freely.'

Rev.xxi.1, 'And he showed me a pure river of water of life.'

Rev.xxii.17, 'And let him, that is athirst, come, and, whosoever will, let him take the water of life freely.'

(xvi) En.liiii.1-6, 'Then I looked and turned myself to another part of the earth, where I beheld a deep valley burning with fire . . . And there my eyes beheld the instruments which they were making,—fettors of iron without weight. Then I enquired of the angel of peace, who proceeded with me, saying, For whom are these fettors and instruments prepared? He replied, These are prepared for the host of Azazel, that they may be delivered over and adjudged to the lowest condemnation, and that their angels may be overwhelmed with hurled stones, as the Lord of spirits has commanded. Michael and Gabriel, Raphael and Phanuel, shall be strengthened in that day, and shall then cast them into a furnace of blazing fire, that the Lord of spirits may be avenged of them for their crimes; because they became ministers of Satan, and seduced those who dwell upon earth.'

En.lxvi.5-8, 'I beheld that valley in which there was a great perturbation, and where the waters were troubled. . . . There arose a strong smell of sulphur, which became mixed with the waters; and the valley of the angels, who had been guilty of seduction, burned underneath its soil. Through that valley also rivers of fire were flowing, to which those angels shall be condemned, who seduced the inhabitants of the earth.'

Comp. Matt.xiii.42, 'And shall cast them into a furnace of fire.'

Matt.xxv.41, 'Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, prepared for the Devil and his angels.'

Rev.xix.20, 'These both were cast alive into a lake of fire, burning with brimstone.'

Rev.xx.1-3, 'And I saw an angel come down from heaven, having the key of the bottomless pit, and a great chain in his hand; and he laid hold on the dragon, that old serpent, which is the Devil, and Satan, . . . and cast him into the bottomless pit, . . . that he should deceive the nations no more.'

Rev.xx.10, 'And the Devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone.'

(xvii) En.lviii.7,8, 'In that day shall be distributed two monsters, a female monster,

whose name is Leviathan, dwelling in the depths of the sea, above the springs of waters, and a male whose name is Behemoth, which possesses the invisible wilderness. His name was Dendayen, in the east of the garden [? in the garden eastward], where the elect and the righteous will dwell; where he received it from my ancestor, who was man,—from Adam the first of men, whom the Lord of spirits made.

Comp. the 'beast rising out of the sea,' and 'another beast coming out of the earth,' Rev. xiii.1,11.

Comp. also 'the great whore that sitteth upon many waters,' and 'the beast that carried her,' Rev. xvii.1,7, in 'the wilderness,' §.3.

(xviii) En.ix.13-16, 'He shall call to every power of the heavens, to all the holy above, and to the power of God. The Cherubim, the Seraphim, and the Ophanim, all the angels of Power, and all the angels of the Lords,—namely, of the Elect One, and of the Other Power, who was upon earth over the water on that day,—shall raise their united voice, shall bless, glorify, praise, and exalt with the spirit of faith, with the spirit of wisdom and patience, with the spirit of mercy, with the spirit of judgment and peace, and with the spirit of benevolence, [*comp.* 'the seven spirits which are before His throne,' Rev.i.4,lii.1,iv.5,v.6.] all shall say with united voice, Blessed is He! and the name of the Lord of spirits shall be blessed for ever and ever: all, (who sleep not) sleeping not, shall bless it in heaven above. All the holy in heaven shall bless it, all the elect who dwell in the garden of life; and every spirit of light, who is capable of blessing, glorifying, exalting and praising, Thy holy name, and every mortal man, more than the powers of heaven, shall glorify and praise Thy name for ever and ever. For great is the mercy of the Lord of spirits; long-suffering is He, and all His works, all His power, great as are the things which He has done, has He revealed to the saints and to the elect in the name of the Lord of spirits.'

Comp. Rev.v.13, 'And every creature which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and such as are in the sea, and all that are in them, heard I saying, Blessing, and honour, and glory, and power, be unto Him that sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb for ever and ever.'

Rev.xix.5, 'And a voice came out of the throne, saying, Praise our God, all ye His servants, and ye that fear Him, both small and great.'

(xix) En.lxi.4-9, 'The word of his mouth shall destroy all the sinners and all the ungodly, who shall perish at his presence . . . Trouble shall come upon them, as upon a woman in travail, whose labour is severe, when her child comes to the mouth of the womb, and she finds it difficult to bring forth. One portion of them shall look upon another: they shall be astonished, and shall abase their countenance; and trouble shall seize them, when they shall behold this Son of Woman sitting upon the throne of his glory.'

Comp. 2Thess.i.9, 'Who shall be punished with everlasting destruction from the presence of the Lord, and from the glory of His power.'

1Thess.v.3, 'Then sudden destruction cometh upon them as travail upon a woman with child, and they shall not escape.'

2Thess.ii.8, 'That Wicked, whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of His mouth.'

Matt.xix.28, 'In the regeneration, when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of His glory.'

Matt.xxv.31, 'When the Son of Man shall come in His glory, then shall He sit upon the throne of his glory.'

Rev.i.16, 'Out of His mouth went a sharp two-edged sword.'

Rev.ii.16, 'I will fight against them with the sword out of My mouth.'

Rev.xix.15, 'Out of His mouth goeth a sharp sword, that with it He should smite the nations.'

Rev.xix.21, 'And the remnant were slain with the sword of Him that sat upon the horse, which [sword] proceeded out of His mouth.'

(xx) En.lxi.12-17, 'All the kings, the princes, the exalted, and those who rule over the earth, shall fall down on their faces before him, and shall worship him. They shall fix their hopes on this Son of Man, shall pray to him, and petition for mercy. Then shall the Lord of spirits hasten to expel them from His presence. Their faces shall be full of confusion, and their faces shall darkness cover. The angels shall take them to punishment, that vengeance may be inflicted on those who have oppressed His children and His elect. . . But the saints and the elect shall be safe in that day . . . The Lord of spirits shall remain over them: and with this Son of Man shall they dwell, eat, lie down, and rise up, for ever and ever.'

Comp. Rev.vii.15, 'He that sitteth on the throne shall dwell among them.'

Rev.vi.15, 'And the kings of the earth, and the great men, and the rich men, and the chief captains, and the mighty men, . . . hid themselves in the dens and rocks of the mountains, and said to the mountains and rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth upon the Throne.'

Rev.xix.18, 'That ye may eat the flesh of kings, and the flesh of captains, and the flesh of mighty men, &c.'

Rev.xxi.3, 'Behold the tabernacle of God is with men, and He will dwell with them, and they shall be His people, and God Himself shall be with them, and be their God.'

(xxi) En.lxx.1-13, 'I beheld the sons of the holy angels, treading on flaming fire, whose garments and robes were white, and whose countenances were transparent as crystal . . . Then I fell on my face before the Lord of spirits. And Michael, one of the archangels, took me by my right hand, raised me up, and brought me out to where was every secret of mercy and secret of righteousness . . . There I beheld in the midst of that light, a building raised with stones of ice [? crystal]. . . The Seraphim, the Cherubim, and the Ophanim, surrounded it; these are those who never sleep, but watch the throne of His glory. And I beheld angels innumerable, thousands of thousands, and ten thousand times ten thousand, who surrounded that habitation. Michael, Raphael, and Gabriel went out of that habitation, and holy angels innumerable.'

With them was the Ancient of Days, whose head was white as wool, and pure, and His robe was indescribable. Then I fell upon my face, while all my flesh was dissolved, and my spirit became changed.'

Comp. Rev. iv. 8, v. 11, i. 14, 17.

(xxii) En. lxxxii. 4, 5, 'I was lying down in the house of my grandfather Malael, when I saw in a vision heaven purifying and snatched away; and, falling to the earth, I saw likewise the earth absorbed by a great abyss.'

En. xcii. 17, 'The former heaven shall depart and pass away, a new heaven shall appear.'

Comp. 2Pet. iii. 10, 'The heavens shall pass away,' the earth also shall be burned up.'

Rev. xxi. 1, 'I saw a new heaven and a new earth; for the first heaven and the first earth were passed away.'

(xxiii) En. lxxxv. 2, 'And, behold, a single star fell from heaven.'

En. lxxxvii. 1-3, 'Then I looked at that one of the four white men, who came forth first. He seized the first star, which fell down from heaven. And, binding it hand and foot, he cast it into a valley, a valley narrow, deep, stupendous, and gloomy.'

Comp. Rev. viii. 10, 'There fell a great star from heaven.'

Rev. ix. 1, 'I saw a star fall from heaven unto the earth.'

(xxiv) En. xciii. 6-xciv. 6, 'Woe to those who build up iniquity and oppression, and who lay the foundation of fraud! for suddenly shall they be subverted, and never know peace.'

'Woe to those who build up their houses with crime! for from the very foundation shall their houses be demolished

'Woe to you who are rich! for in your riches have ye trusted, but from your riches you shall be removed, because you have not remembered the most High in the days of your prosperity.'

'You have committed blasphemy and iniquity, and are destined to the day of the effusion of blood, to the day of darkness, and to the day of the great judgment

'Woe to you, who recompense your neighbour with evil! for you shall be recompensed according to your works.'

'Woe to you, ye false witnesses, you who aggravate iniquity! for you shall suddenly perish.'

'Woe to you, ye sinners! for ye reject the righteous.'

En. civ. 1, 2, 'I swear to you, ye righteous, that in heaven the angels record your goodness before the glory of the Mighty One. Wait with patient hope; for formerly you have been disgraced with evil and with affliction; but now shall you shine like the luminaries of heaven. Your cries have cried for judgment; and it has appeared to you; for an account of all your suffering shall be required from the princes, and from everyone who has assisted your plunderers. Wait with patient hope, nor relinquish your confidence; for great joy shall be yours, like that of the angels in heaven.'

Comp. Luke vi. 24-26, James v. 1-8.

1127. These are only a few instances of the influence, which this remarkable Book seems to have exercised upon the

minds of devout men in the first age of Christianity. In the language attributed to Our Lord Himself,—in that of St. Paul, especially in his *early* epistles,—in that of St. James, St. Peter, and St. Jude,—we can distinctly trace an intimate acquaintance with it, and recognise its forms of expression. But, above all, this is true of the Book of the Revelations, where, it is plain, very much of the imagery has been directly adopted from that of the Book of Enoch. And, though the apostolic authorship of some of the above writings may be questioned, yet the fact remains as before, that the writers of these Scriptures, whoever they were, appear to have been well acquainted with this Book, and more or less imbued with its teaching.

1128. And, certainly, some of the language above quoted must be admitted to be very grand and impressive;—especially if we consider that the version, from which we have quoted, is a recent translation of a translation, and has to recommend it, neither the prestige of *early* association, nor the flavour of antiquity, which modify insensibly our judgment of the Scripture language with which it is compared. We cannot wonder at the effect which it seems to have produced upon the minds of readers in that age, and in still later days,—more especially when it was actually believed to be the authentic record of the prophecies of 'Enoch the seventh from Adam,' who, therefore, must have been supposed to have *originated*, and not imitated, the imagery of the Book of Daniel, and that remarkable expression, 'the Ancient of Days.' Nevertheless, mixed up with all these noble utterances, is a great mass of matter of the most fantastic and fabulous character, which has probably prevented the book being handed down to us, stamped with the high authority which it had in those first centuries of Christian teaching.

1129. Archb. LAURENCE says, p. lvi :—

Upon the whole, then, if this singular book be censured, as abounding in some parts with fable and fiction, still should we recollect that fable and fiction may occasionally prove both amusing and instructive, and can then only be deemed injurious, when pressed into the

service of vice and infidelity. Nor should we forget that much—perhaps, most—of what we censure was founded upon a national tradition, the antiquity of which alone, independent of other considerations, had rendered it respectable. That the author was uninspired, will scarcely now be questioned. But, although his production was apocryphal, it ought not therefore to be stigmatised as necessarily replete with error. Although it be on that account incapable of becoming a rule of faith, it may nevertheless contain much moral as well as religious truth, and may be justly regarded as a correct standard of the doctrine of the times in which it was composed. *Non omnia esse concedenda antiquitati*, 'that not everything is to be allowed to antiquity,' is, it is true, a maxim founded upon reason and experience. But in perusing the present relic of a remote age and country, should the reader discover much to condemn, still, unless he be too fastidious, he will find more to approve; if he sometimes frown, he may oftener smile; nor seldom will he be disposed to admire the vivid imagination of the writer, which transports him far beyond the flaming boundaries of the world,—

extra
Processit longè flammania mœnia mundi.

'Past the world's flaming walls has far advanced,—

displaying to him every secret of Creation,—the splendours of heaven, and the terrors of hell,—the mansions of departed souls,—and the myriads of the celestial hosts, the Seraphim, Cherubim, and Ophanim, which surround the blazing throne, and magnify the Holy Name of the great Lord of Spirits, the Almighty Father of men and of angels.

GFRÖRER also writes, *Jahrhundert des Heils*, p. 105, 109 :—

I salute our Enoch as in a certain sense a fore-announcer of the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ,—not as if he had a perception of the truth, for his Messias is, as in the case of other Jews, enveloped in a cloud of ambition and false hopes :—but he is still an evidence to show with what kind of feeling, and with what glowing earnestness, twenty or thirty years before Christ, the Anointed of the Lord was expected. . . . There is no better source, from which may be derived a knowledge of the state of the Jewish form of faith before, and in the days of, Jesus Christ.

1130. But especially it deserves notice that almost all the language of the New Testament, in which the judgment of the Last Day is described,—the *Eschatology*, as it is called, of the N.T.,—appears to have been directly derived from the language of the Book of Enoch, as will be seen from the passages quoted above, (iv), (xiii), (xvi), (xix), (xx). The 'everlasting chains,' in which the fallen angels are 'kept under darkness, unto the judgment of the great day,'—the 'everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels,'

—the 'Son of Man sitting upon the throne of His glory,' choosing for the righteous their 'countless habitations,' and destroying the wicked with the word of His mouth,—the 'book of life opened' before the Judge,—earth, hell, and the grave, 'giving up their dead,'—the joy of the righteous, the shame and confusion of the wicked, who are led off by the angels to punishment,—the 'new heaven' and the 'new earth,' old things having passed away,—the 'furnace of fire,' and the 'lake of fire,'—all these appear in the Book of Enoch, and the last, the 'lake of fire,' is, manifestly (xvi), a figure introduced with distinct reference to the Dead Sea; and, accordingly, in the same connection, we find 'the angels, which kept not their first estate,' coupled with 'Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them,' Jude 7, which are spoken of as 'going after strange flesh,' like those angels, and being 'set for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire.' Nay, those awful words spoken of Judas, 'It had been good for that man if he had never been born,' find their counterpart also (viii) in the language of this Book.

1131. This fact is of great importance. For it shows that these were popular expressions, which were in common use in the mouths of devout men of that time, and must, therefore, be interpreted according to their general spirit, and not be pressed too far in their literal meaning. To the Jews of those days, acquainted with the Book of Enoch, these images would be quite familiar,—like those which speak of the 'stars falling,' the 'Son of Man coming in a cloud with power and great glory,' or those again, which were evidently current in the popular talk, about 'Abraham's bosom,' the 'torments of hell,' and the 'great gulf fixed.'

1132. It is not impossible that the Book of Enoch, as it now exists, may contain some Christian interpolations of a later date, as we know to be the case with another famous apocryphal book, the 'Sibylline Oracles.' But, however this may be, the Epistle of Jude seems plainly to recognise some por-

tions, at least, of the Book of Enoch, as already existing, and as authentic and authoritative. Hence, even should any critics propose to place the composition of the *whole* 'Book' at a later date than that assigned to it by Archbp. LAURENCE and GFRÖRER,* the age of the Epistle would have to be depressed with it, to a time far later than that of the Apostles,—to a time, when the real origin of the 'Book' had been forgotten, and its contents could be confidently quoted, as the veritable words of the antediluvian Patriarch. And, generally, the occurrence of such expressions, as we have quoted above, common to the Book of Enoch and to so many of the apostolical writings, shows plainly the forms of thought and language, which were prevalent among the Jews in the first age of Christianity.

1133. We must remember, therefore, from what sources such expressions as these were drawn, and not suppose that they are meant to convey to us accurate information about the details of the invisible world. The substantial truth, which underlies these figures, is the fact,—the belief in which is deep-

seated, by the gift of God, in our nature,—of the everlasting distinction between right and wrong, and of a Perfect Justice, presiding over the universe of moral being, which, as it is not always manifested clearly in this life, we believe with undoubting confidence, will be revealed assuredly hereafter. Truths, such as these, which underlie the figures of the N.T., are not less true, nor is their authority less binding, because we are able to trace their historical growth, just as the excellence of the Lord's Prayer is not diminished, because we know that it is made up of petitions, which were current already among the Jews.* Rather, this very growth among men, of the recognition of a great Eternal Truth, gives us the comforting assurance of the Presence of a Living God in History,—not only advancing continually the intellectual development of mankind, but—enlightening and inspiring, with ever-increasing Light and Life, the *hearts* of His children.

* Mr. WESTCOTT says on this point, SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, i.p.547: Notwithstanding the arguments of HILGENFELD and JOSS, the whole book appears to be distinctly of Jewish origin. Some inconsiderable interpolations may have been made in successive translations, and large fragments of a much *earlier* date were undoubtedly incorporated into the work. But, as a whole, it may be regarded as *describing an important phase of Jewish opinion, shortly before the coming of Christ.*

* On this point GFRÖRER writes, vol.i, Part ii.p.149: 'I have, as it is seen, developed out of the books of the Jews the principles, according to which the 'Lord's Prayer' is composed. Not only is its character Jewish, but so also are the separate clauses, which occur in different Jewish prayers, (see LIGHTFOOT, SCHÖTTGEN, WETSTEIN on Matt.vi.9, WIRSIUS.) It may be that it was a prayer already in use before the time of Jesus: probably, however, it was then first put together out of earlier prayers. Though, generally, the portions of it agree verbally with already existing Jewish prayers, yet I have nowhere found the *whole* among Jewish writers, though they have, however, many similar prayers.'

THE PENTATEUCH

AND BOOK OF JOSHUA

CRITICALLY EXAMINED

BY THE RIGHT REV.

JOHN WILLIAM COLENSO, D.D.

BISHOP OF NATAL.

'We can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.'—*St. Paul*, 2 Cor. xiii. 8.

'Not to exceed, and not to fall short of facts,—not to add, and not to take away,—to state the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,—are the grand, the vital, maxims of Inductive Science, of English Law, and, let us add, of Christian Faith.'

Quarterly Review on 'Essays and Reviews,' Oct. 1861, p. 369.

PART V.

LONDON:

LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, ROBERTS, & GREEN.

1865.

LONDON
PRINTED BY SPOTTISWOODE AND CO.
NEW-STREET SQUARE

CONTENTS.

CHAP.	PAGE
PREFACE	361
I. GEN.VI.1—VI.4	365
II. GEN.VI.5—VI.22	367
III. THE FLOOD EXPLAINED BY TRADITIONAL WRITERS	371
IV. GEN.VII.1—VIII.22	375
V. WAS NOAH'S FLOOD A PARTIAL DELUGE?	378
VI. STORIES OF THE FLOOD AMONG OTHER NATIONS	380
VII. GEN.IX.1—IX.29	384
VIII. GEN.X.1—X.32	388
IX. IDENTITY OF LANGUAGE OF THE HEBREWS AND CANAANITES	394
X. THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, WHENCE DERIVED	397
XI. GEN.XI.1—XI.9	401
XII. GEN.XI.10—XI.26	405
XIII. SCRIPTURE REFERENCES TO THE CREATION, THE FALL, AND THE DELUGE	411
XIV. CONCLUDING REMARKS	415
APP. THE COMPLETE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE IN GENESIS	421

Our little systems have their day ;
They have their day, and cease to be :
They are but broken lights of Thee,
And Thou, O Lord, art more than they.

We have but faith ; we cannot know ;
For knowledge is of things we see ;
And yet we trust it comes from Thee—
A beam in darkness ; let it grow.

Let knowledge grow from more to more,
But more of reverence in us dwell ;
That mind and soul, according well,
May make one music as before,

But vaster. We are fools and slight ;
We mock Thee, when we do not fear :
But help Thy foolish ones to bear ;
Help Thy vain worlds to bear Thy Light.

TENNYSON, *In Memoriam*, p.vi.

PREFACE TO PART V.

I HAVE given in the body of this Part the scientific arguments, which show conclusively that no Deluge, such as that described in G.vi-viii,—whether regarded as a *Universal* or a *Partial* Deluge,—could ever have happened within an age extending vastly beyond the era of the Noachian Deluge. Among other matters, I have drawn special attention to the very decisive evidence afforded on this point by the actual state of the volcanic cones of Auvergne, as attested by the concurrent evidence of some of the most eminent geologists of the present day.

My statements have been challenged by one or more clergymen, writing in defence of the traditionary view.

It is denied that the volcanic hills in question are of such great antiquity, and in proof of this reference is made (i) to two letters from SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, Bishop of Clermont, in Auvergne, (ii) to a homily of AVITUS, *De Rogationibus*, and (iii) to the History of GREGORY of Tours, from which it is inferred as follows:—

It be will seen from these authorities that the last eruptions from these volcanoes, which were most severe, occurred in the reign of Guntheric, A.D. 460-2—that they threw up ashes and pumice in such vast quantities as fell in ‘Sodomitic showers,’ even in the vicinity of Vienne—that the three authors first above-named were contemporary and eyewitnesses,—and that, from their continuance for nearly three years, entire new cones could hardly fail to be formed. . . .

It further appears that a three days’ fast and humiliation being held, to beseech the removal of these calamities, and being begged by Mamertus of all neighbouring churches, it came to be annually repeated, and copied throughout not only all Gaul, but also Britain, under the name of Rogation Days, the anniversary continued in our calendar to this hour.

I will first translate the following account of the institution of ‘Rogation Days’ from HOFFMAN’S ‘Lexicon,’ iv. p. 77:—

Days of Rogation, to be celebrated with prayers and fastings before the Ascension of Christ, were instituted on account of an earthquake and incursions of wild beasts, by Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne, A.D. 446. There are three of them which are celebrated before the Lord’s Ascension, according to the custom of the Gallic church. The wild beasts by which the Gauls were then infested were chiefly wolves. When these raged fiercely against the Gauls, and no remedy could be found for this scourge, the bishops of the Gallic provinces, being collected at Vienne, appointed in common that they should implore the mercy of God by a three days’ fast. When this turned out happily, it came to pass that these days came into a custom of annual celebration, which also at the present time are observed carefully through the provinces of Gaul for diverse calamities.

Thus, according to the above author, the institution of Rogation Days had no connection with ‘volcanic eruptions,’ but was due to an ‘earthquake,’ and chiefly the ‘incursions of wild beasts’ at Vienne. Vienne, however, is in Dauphiny, not in Auvergne, But the fact is, that there are no signs of any volcanic action whatever in or near to the city of Vienne, though there are in the

Vivaraïs, in the neighbouring department. As Dr. DAUBENY observes, 'Volcanoes,' 2nd edit., p. 66, Note:—

There are no volcanoes near Vienne; but the bishop's diocese may have extended into the neighbouring department of Ardèche, where they occur so abundantly.

But the volcanoes in Auvergne and those in the Vivaraïs are two distinct groups, which, as the same authority tells us, p. 32,—

although scarcely a hundred miles distant from each other, are nevertheless divided by a barrier of primary rocks, and belong apparently to independent systems. . . .

To infer that the volcanoes of Auvergne were in a state of activity at the time when those of the Vivaraïs showed symptoms of disturbance, would be as rash as to presume that the extinct volcano of Mount Vultur, in Apulia, was roused into activity in the first century of the Christian era, because ancient writers have recorded the ravages made at that time by Vesuvius.

GREGORY of Tours died A.D. 595, more than 130 years after the phenomena, whatever they were, of A.D. 460–2, of which we are speaking. But, in truth, this writer does not speak of any 'eruptions.' He says only, ii. Ep. 34:—

He (Avitus) relates in a certain homily which he wrote about Rogations, that these same Rogations, which we celebrate before the triumph of the Lord's Ascension, were instituted by Mamertus, bishop of the said city of Vienne, over which also he then presided, at a time when that city was terrified by many prodigies. For it was frequently shaken by an earthquake; and, moreover, the wild nature of deer and wolves having entered the gates, wandered (he wrote) about the whole city, fearing nothing. And when this occurred through the circle of a year, upon the approach of the days of the Paschal solemnity, the whole people were devoutly awaiting the mercy of God, that, at least, this day of great solemnity might bring an end to this terror. But on the very watch of the night of glory, while the solemnities of the mass were being celebrated, suddenly the royal palace within the walls is set in flames by divine fire. All being utterly terrified with fear, and having gone out of the church, believing that either all the city might be consumed by this conflagration, or certainly might yawn in chasms with the rending asunder of the earth, the holy priest, prostrate before the altar, with groans and tears implores the mercy of the Lord. Why more? The prayer of the renowned chief-priest penetrated the lofty regions of the sky, and the stream of flowing tears quenched the flames of the house.

It is plain that there is nothing here about 'Sodomitic showers.' Gregory speaks only of 'earthquakes,' the strange entrance of wild animals into the city, and the palace set in flames by divine fire, i.e., apparently by a stroke of lightning.

Secondly, AVITUS, the successor of Mamertus, who was really a 'contemporary and eyewitness,' writes as follows:—

And, indeed, I know that many of us recollect the causes of the terrors of that time. Forsooth, frequent conflagrations, repeated earthquakes, nightly sounds, kept threatening a sort of prodigious graveyard for a kind of funeral of the whole world. For an appearance of wild animals in a state of tameness presented itself to large gatherings of people, God only knows whether deluding the eyes or drawn by portents; whichever, however, of these two was the case, it was understood to be equally monstrous, whether thus in reality the savage hearts of brutes could be softened, or the phantasms of false vision could be formed so horribly before the sight of terrified men. Meanwhile the feeling of the common people took different directions, and the opinions of different ranks were various. Some, dissembling what they thought, attributed to chance what they were unwilling to give to tears; others, of a better mind, interpreted each new portent by suitable significations of the fitness of the plagues. For who, amidst frequent fires, would not fear Sodomitic showers? Who, when the elements were trembling, would not believe that either the fall of the roof, or the disruption of the ground was imminent? Who, when he saw, or certainly thought he saw, deer, fearful by nature, penetrate through the narrow gates as far as the spacious forum, would not dread an impending feeling of desolation?

Here again there is no mention of 'Sodomitic showers,' as having been *rained from heaven* upon the city of Vienne, but of fires such as that of the palace struck by lightning, or others caused by the 'fall of the roofs' from repeated earthquakes, which brought to

mind the destruction of Sodom, and made the people dread a recurrence of 'Sodomitic showers.'

Lastly, the Letter of SIDONIUS, vii. Ep. 1, begins thus:—

There is a rumour that the Goths have moved their camp into Roman soil. For to this irruption we, miserable people of Auvergne, are always the gate.

And he goes on to say that he depends for deliverance not upon earthly defences, but upon the Rogations, which had been instituted by Mamertus, and in which the people of Auvergne had begun to practise. He then proceeds:—

For it does not escape our inquiries what kind of prodigies those were, under whose terrifying effect the city, committed from Heaven to your care, was being emptied in the first times, when these prayers were instituted. For now the sites of the public walls were shaken by frequent earthquakes; now fires, often with flames (*ignes sepe flammati*), heaped up the fallen ridges of the roofs with a piled-up mountain of ashes; now the fearful tameness of audacious deer placed their portentous beds in the forum; whilst thou meanwhile, the state of the city being thinned by the departure of the nobles and populace, quickly hadst recourse to a new example of the ancient Ninevites, lest thy despair also should mock the Divine admonition. And truly thou, least of all men, after experience of thy virtues, couldst distrust God without sin. For when once, by chance, the city had begun to burn, thy faith grew the hotter by that heat; and when in the sight of the fearful people, by the mere presentation of thy body, the fire struck back, wound its retreating way in fugitive curves, by a miracle, terrible, new, unwonted, it happened to the flame to give way through reverence, which by nature was devoid of feeling.

Here, again, we have mention made of 'earthquakes,' and of 'flaming fires, piling up ashes on the fallen roofs'; but there is nothing said of volcanic eruptions; and these fires seem to be the same as those mentioned by AVITUS, which were kindled by the roofs falling in upon the household fires, through repeated earthquakes. Accordingly Dr. DAUBENY says, in his 'Volcanoes':—

I submit to my readers whether the entire silence of SIDONIUS as to the existence of volcanoes in Auvergne, although his residence was on the borders of the Lake Aidat, which, as we have seen, was caused by an eruption from one of the most modern of those which had desolated the country, is not a strong negative evidence of their antiquity, especially when this author dwells in his poems on the scenery of his own neighbourhood, and even compares its natural beauties with those of Baïæ, a spot which he must have known, to be in the neighbourhood of a burning mountain. How natural would it have been for him, after he had said, with reference to his baths on the Lake of Aidat—

High rise the heights like to the Baian cone,

Like too, with half-clothed summit, shines the peak;—

to have added that, in its vicinity too, as in that of Baïæ, there was a mountain vomiting forth flames, supposing any such phenomenon to have been familiar to him, near the spot where he resided!—p.33.

Although the testimony of SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS and of ALCIMUS AVITUS should persuade us that some indications of activity were manifested, about the fourth century after Christ, by the igneous agents that may be supposed to exist in the bowels of the earth at no great distance from the city of Vienne, yet it would seem more probable that the reports of these writers had reference to earthquakes than to true volcanic eruptions that occurred in this district.—p.66.

In the *Athenæum*, No. 1,020, we find the following report of a lecture by Sir CHARLES (then Mr.) LYELL:—

Before considering these, Mr. LYELL entered into a short digression to refute the doctrine of the mediæval origin of the volcanoes near Clermont (Auvergne), advanced by a writer in the *Quarterly Review* for October, 1844, p.295, where it is pretended that SIDONIUS APOLLINARIS, Bishop of Clermont, who flourished at the close of the fifth century, has borne explicit testimony to the 'volcanic eruption, the crumbling of the cones, and the heaping up of the showers of ashes and scoræ, cast forth amidst their fires.' The passages relied on occur in a letter from SIDONIUS to his contemporary, Mamertus, Bishop of Vienne in Dauphny, written when Auvergne was threatened with a fresh irruption of the Goths, to avert which danger the bishop proposes to adopt certain forms of prayer (rogations, or litanies), which Mamertus

had already introduced on the occasion of some 'prodigies,' which had happened in Dauphiny sixteen years before. In alluding to these phenomena SIDONIUS says that 'the walls of the city of Vienne were shaken by frequent earthquakes, many fires broke out, and mounds of ashes were heaped up over the falling copings of the walls.' Deer also took refuge in the forum, and the people fled; all but the bishop, who had a right to reckon on divine protection, because, as SIDONIUS reminds him, on a former occasion the flames at his approach had miraculously receded, out of reverence to his holy person. At the time of the earthquake he (Mamertus) had told his people that their repentant tears would extinguish the fires sooner than rivers of water, and the steadfastness of their faith would cause the rocking of the ground to cease. SIDONIUS finishes with asking the Bishop of Vienne to send him some relics to make all secure. The style of the whole epistle is so faulty, ambitious, and poetical, as to make it difficult to know the exact value of the expressions, and dangerous to found upon them any philosophical argument about natural events. There is not a word about Auvergne, but simply an allusion to the shocks which appear to have thrown down buildings (at Vienne) and caused (as usual in such cases, where roofs fall in) great conflagrations and heaps of cinders. The terror of the wild animals when the earth rocks, and their sensitiveness to the slightest movements, are well known. Although the epistle proves SIDONIUS to have had a fair share of the credulity of his age, both in respect of miracles wrought in favour of a contemporary saint, and the efficacy of relics, it would be unfair to charge him with a belief in the occurrence of a volcanic eruption at or near the site of the city of Vienne, which the investigations of the ablest government surveyors, to whom the construction of a geological map of France has been entrusted, have entirely disproved. There are, in fact, no monuments of volcanos, ancient or modern, in Dauphiny; and, if there had been, they would not throw light on the date of eruptions in Auvergne.

Sir CHARLES LYELL writes thus also in his *Elements of Geology*, 6th Ed. p.684:—

The brim of the water of the Puy de Pariou near Clermont is so sharp, and has been so little blunted by time, that it scarcely affords room to stand upon. This and other cones in an equally remarkable state of integrity have stood, I conceive, uninjured, [by ordinary rain, but not by the waters of a Deluge,] not in spite of their loose porous nature, as might at first be rationally supposed, but in consequence of it. No rills can collect where all the rain is absorbed by the sand and scoræ, as is remarkably the case on Etna; and nothing but a waterspout breaking directly upon the Puy de Pariou, [or the waters of a Deluge surging upon it,] could carry away a portion of the hill, so long as it is not rent or engulfed by earthquakes.

Hence it is conceivable that even those cones, which have the freshest aspect and most perfect shape, may lay claim to very high antiquity. Dr. DAUBENY has justly observed that, had any of these volcanos been in a state of activity in the age of Julius Cæsar, that general, who encamped upon the plains of Auvergne, and laid siege to its principal city (Gergovia, near Clermont), could hardly have failed to notice them. Had there being any record of their eruptions in the time of PLINY or SIDONIUS APOLLINARIUS, the one would scarcely have omitted to make mention of it in his Natural History, nor the other to introduce some allusion to it among the descriptions of this his native province. This poet's residence was on the borders of the Lake Aïdat, which owed its very existence to the damming up of a river by one of the most modern lava-currents.

Lastly, the reader will observe that nothing would be proved against the scientific evidence of the impossibility of the Noachian Deluge as a matter of fact, if it could even be shown that *some* of these volcanic cones are of more recent date. If there is *one* ancient cone—and Sir CHARLES LYELL, as quoted below in (1180), says there are many—composed of 'loose ashes,' 'an incoherent heap of scoræ and spongy ejectamenta,' which still 'stands unmolested,' it is plain that no 'Noah's Flood' can have covered the earth, when, as the same authority has stated—

Had the waters once risen, even for a day, so high as to reach the level of the base of one of these cones,—had there been a single Flood 50 or 60 feet in height since the last eruption occurred,—a great part of these volcanoes must inevitably have been swept away.

J. W. NATAL.

LONDON: Feb. 24, 1865.

PART V.

THE FIRST ELEVEN CHAPTERS OF GENESIS

(continued).

CHAPTER I.

GEN. VI. 1-VI. 4.

1134. G. vi. 1, 2.

'And it came to pass that man began to multiply upon the face of the ground, and daughters were born to them. And the sons of Elohim saw the daughters of men that they were goodly: and they took to them wives of all whom they chose.'

By 'sons of God' the Scripture invariably means 'angels,' Job i. 6, ii. 1, xxxviii. 7, Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 7: and, accordingly, the Book of Enoch gives a very full account of the doings of these angels, who 'sinned' and 'left their first estate,' and their punishment, as described in this book (1126. xvi.), is distinctly referred to in 2 Pet. ii. 4, Jude 6. In the face of these facts, it is not easy to suppose, as some have suggested, that the expression here means only 'Sethites,' who are called 'sons of Elohim' on account of their piety, by which they were distinguished from the Cainites, who are described, generally, as 'man,'—or that it means 'rulers, chiefs, &c.' in opposition to the people of lower rank, &c. On either of these suppositions, indeed, it is difficult to see how 'giants' could have been conceived to have sprung from the union.

1135. But this notion of the 'sons of God,' descending to the beautiful 'daughters of men,' appears to have been borrowed from foreign and heathen sources.

The sons of God cannot here be identical with the angels, or with the sons of God

mentioned in other parts of Scripture: they are not of Hebrew, but of general Eastern origin. And these notions were, gradually, more and more amplified; they were enlarged from other heathen sources, or from the fictions of imagination. The Book of Enoch shows that the chief of these sons of Heaven, Samyaza, at first opposed their wicked design. But they pledged themselves by awful oaths and imprecations to execute it. They descended, two hundred in number, to Mount Hermon; they chose wives, taught them sorcery and conjuration, introduced ornaments of vanity and luxury, bracelets and trinkets, paints and costly stuffs. Giants, three thousand cubits high, were the offspring of these alliances. They first consumed all the produce of the earth; then they devoured all the animals, and afterwards began to turn against the men. The cries of the earth rose up to heaven. The angels, Michael and Gabriel, Sargan and Urgan, brought the complaint before the throne of God. He precipitated Azazel, the most wicked of the 'sons of God,' into a dark cavern, where he lies in fetters, and covered with rough pointed stones, in order to be thrown into the burning pool on the great day of judgment. He inspired the progeny of these unnatural unions with fierce rage; and the consequence was that they destroyed each other in mutual murder, after which they were tied to subterranean hills, to remain there for seventy generations, and then to be for ever hurled into the fiery abyss. But he assured the son of Lamech, that an approaching deluge would spare him and his children, to become the ancestors of better generations. KALISCH, *Gen.* p. 171.

1136. G. vi. 3.

'And Jehovah said, My spirit shall not preside in man for ever.'

DELITZSCH notes on this, p. 236:—

Here is not meant the Holy Spirit with its judging, punishing power, but, with reference to ii. 7, the created human spirit, which on account of its Divine origin and God-related nature, or, perhaps, only as the Divine gift, is called by God 'My spirit.' This rules

(presides) in man, inasmuch as it animates and governs the bodily part of man.

The expression 'for ever' is used apparently to denote merely a long time, as in the following instances:—

IS. I. 22, 'I will bring him, that he may appear before Jehovah, and there abide *for ever*.'

IS. xx. 15, 'But thou shalt not cut off thy kindness from my house *for ever*.'

1137. G. vi. 3.

'And his days shall be a hundred and twenty years.'

TUCH explains these words as follows, p. 157:—

This shall henceforward be the limit of human life, with reference to the much greater age of the Patriarchs, G. v. The objection has been made that, even after the Flood, the Patriarchs still overstepped this limit of life, and so these words have been explained to mean, 'I will still give them a respite of 120 years, within which they may repent.' But here it is overlooked that the continually decreasing term of life at length reaches that limit, [Aaron, 123 years, N. xxxiii. 39,—Moses, 120, D. xxxiv. 7,—Joshua, 110, Jo. xxiv. 29], and so the divine determination takes effect. If the author had meant to express this thought, he would infallibly have made the time to the Flood extend to 120 years, which the data in v. 32, vi. 6, make impossible.

The data, to which TUCH refers, show that Noah was 500 years old *before* the announcement in vi. 3 was made, and 600 years old when the Flood began, so that only 100 years could have intervened. But the fact is that the great ages of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, are due to the *Elohists*, not to the Jehovistic author of the verse before us.

1138. G. vi. 4.

'The giants were in the earth in those days.'

The *Targ. Jon.* paraphrases here:—

Schamchazai (i.e. Samyaza, of the book of Enoch) and Uzziel, who fell from heaven, were on the earth in those days.

As already observed (1107) in the case of the descendants of Cain, the writer,—who may be endeavouring to account for the existence of the supposed giant races of the Mosaic times, 'great, many, and tall,' the Emim, Anakim, Zamzummim, &c., which, according to the old legends, reported by the Deuteronomist, ii. 10, 11, 20, once lived in that 'land of giants,' on both sides of the Jordan,—seems to have lost sight of the fact, that all these

gigantic beings, the product of this mixture of the 'sons of Elohim' with the 'daughters of man,' must have been swept away by the Deluge.

1139. It may be that the notion of the existence of gigantic men in the primitive times, which is found among so many nations, has really arisen from the discoveries of huge bones, the remains of extinct animals, which have been ignorantly supposed to be human bones, and has been confirmed, perhaps, by the gigantic statues and vast architectural structures of Egypt, Assyria, the Peloponnese, &c., among which may be reckoned also the massive ruins of the Transjordanic lands (592). Or it may have expressed originally the sense of man, that he was surrounded by gigantic powers in nature, to which he gave a human form, as the Arabs do to their 'jins' at this day.

1140. Mr. FARRAR writes, SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, i. p. 688:—

The general belief (until very recent times) in the existence of fabulously enormous men, arose from fancied giant-graves, (see De la VALLE'S *Travels in Persia*, ii. 89,) and above all from the discovery of huge bones, which were taken for those of men, in days when comparative anatomy was unknown. Even the ancient Jews were thus misled, JOSEPH. V. ii. 3,—['There were till then left the race of giants, who had bodies so large and countenances so entirely different from other men, that they were surprising to the sight, and terrible to the hearing. The bones of these men are still shown to this very day, unlike to any credible relations of other men.'] AUGUSTINE appeals triumphantly to this argument, and mentions a molar tooth which he had seen in Utica a hundred times larger than ordinary teeth (*de Civ. Dei*, xv. 9). No doubt, it once belonged to an elephant. VIVES, in his commentary on the place, mentions a tooth as big as a fist, which was shown at St. Christopher's. In fact, this source of delusion has only very recently been dispelled. Most bones, which have been exhibited, have turned out to belong to whales or elephants, as was the case with the vertebra of a supposed giant, examined by Sir HANS SLOANE in Oxfordshire.

1141. So VIRGIL believed, not only that there had been a diminution of size from primeval times, but that this diminution would continue. When he speaks of the slaughter on the plain of Pharsalia, he pictures the ploughman as going over the ground centuries afterwards, and says, *Georg.* i. 497:—

And digging up the graves at the huge bones Will marvel.

That, however, the stature of the human race was really the same, generally, in those days as now, is shown by the remains discovered in ancient tombs and in the pyramids.

1142. KALISCH notes, *Gen.p.171*:—

Men of such extraordinary size seem never to have lived. The human race has remained essentially the same in its physical proportions ever since the historical time. The large bones, which have occasionally been found, are the remains of huge antediluvian [old-world] animals, not of human beings. And the men, who have been mentioned in history for their size, as being eight or nine feet high, are as rare exceptions as the men 'with six fingers on every hand, and with six toes on every foot,' 2S.xxi.20, and are no proof of a time when whole races of such men existed.

1143. And so KENRICK observes, *Prim. Hist.*, p.71-74:—

The mythology of several ancient nations represents the dominion of the gods as not having been established without struggles with powerful enemies, by whom they even suffered partial and temporary defeat. The general idea, which such myths embody, is derived partly from the conflicting forces which are still active in nature, and appear to have possessed even greater energy in primeval times, partly from the mixture of evil with good, which pervades nature and human life. In the Greek mythology, in which a moral element seldom appears, the conflict of the gods with the Titans denotes merely the slow and reluctant submission of the vast and turbulent powers of nature to those laws, by which the actual system is preserved in harmony and order. The giants, who endeavoured to storm heaven, and were buried in the Phlegræan fields or under Mount Etna, represent the violent disturbance which volcanic agency introduces. The Egyptian Typhon combines physical and moral evil: so does the Ahriman of the Zoroastrian mythology. These fictions show, not only that man has been universally conscious of the mixed influences to which he is subject, but also of the preponderance of the good.

The fiction of a race of giants, engaged in warfare with the gods, is so remote from all historical probability, that its true nature is at once seen. But it may be thought that there is something of an historical foundation for the very prevalent belief that a race, of stature, strength, and longevity far surpassing that of later degenerate days, has once occupied the earth, and even left on it the traces of mighty works. We by no means deny the possibility that such a race may have existed; but . . . the direct evidence will be found to be fallacious. . . . The supposed remains of gigantic human bones, which afford to popular credulity an argument of their former existence, when examined, prove to be those of cetaceous animals or elephants. The traditions which ascribe great works to them,

are only proofs how completely the remembrance of their real origin has been lost. Looking upward from the base of the Great Pyramid, we might suppose it the work of giants: but it is entered by passages admitting with difficulty a man of the present size, and we find in the centre a sarcophagus about six feet long. The strength and stature of the men of past ages have been exaggerated, from the same causes as their happiness and their virtue.

CHAPTER II.

GEN.VI.5-VI.22.

1144. G.vi.16.

'A light shalt thou make for the Ark, and unto a cubit shalt thou finish it upward.'

If we were obliged to regard this story of the Flood as historically true, the question, of course, would arise, how the animals in the *three* stories, or, if one was used for the food, in *two* of them, could have had the necessary supplies of air and light, if there was only one window, and that, apparently, only a cubit, = 22 inches, high.

1145. Mr. PEROWNE writes on this point as follows:—

If the words, 'unto a cubit shalt thou finish it above,' refer to the window, and not to the ark itself, they seem to imply that this aperture, or skylight, extended to the breadth of a cubit the whole length of the roof [525 feet]. But, if so, it could not have been merely an open slit, for that would have admitted the rain. Are we then to suppose that some transparent, or at least translucent, substance was employed? It would almost seem so. *Note.* The only serious objection to this explanation is the supposed improbability of any substance like glass having been discovered at that early period of the world's history. . . . Arts and sciences may have reached a ripeness, of which the record, from its scantiness, conveys no adequate conception. [In that case, would the ark have had only *one* 'skylight' and *one* door?] But besides the windows there was to be a door. This was to be placed in the side of the ark. 'The door must have been of some size to admit the larger animals, for whose ingress it was mainly intended. It was, no doubt, above the highest draught-mark of the ark, and the animals ascended to it probably by a sloping embankment.' SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, ii. p.565.

1146. DELITZSCH also notes, *p.250* :

According to BAUMGARTEN'S idea, this opening, a cubit wide, was carried along the whole upper length of the Ark, and, what must also be conceived in addition to this, was *overarched*,—[i.e. was supplied with some kind of *pent-house*, to keep the floods of rain from beating in, when the window was opened to admit air.] Was it also carried

along both sides of the ship? [But, as there were *three* stories, even thus a great many of the creatures would have had no light or air,—not to lay stress on the fact that, in viii. 6, Noah is spoken of as ‘opening the window which he had made,’ which seems plainly to imply that this window was small enough to be so opened, and was specially intended for the use of Noah himself and his family.] On the other hand, most commentators understand a window a cubit each way,—according to TUCH, for giving light to Noah’s chamber, while the animals had to be in darkness. So LUTHER, after the *Vulgate*. This explanation is so far modified by the *Syriac*, that the Heb. word for window, *tsohar*, is taken *collectively*, [= a row of windows]; but this is not probable, not so much because in viii. 6 mention is made of only one ‘window,’ *khallon*, as because then the number of the windows would have been given. [Still the difficulty of having light and air in the different stories remains.] . . . Are we to think of this window, or row of windows, as *transparent*? The name *tsohar*, ‘light,’ is favourable to this supposition: also from viii. 7, 9, it seems that we must imagine a casement, so that the birds flew to and fro before a transparent window, [of *glass* or of *horn*?] without being able to get in, until Noah opened the window.

1147. G.v. 17.

‘I am bringing the Flood of waters upon the earth.’

It is plain from the whole description of the Flood, and especially from the mention of *Eden, Havilah, Ethiopia, Assyria, Euphrates*, in G. ii, as well as the ‘land of Nod’ in iv. 16, that the face of the earth was supposed by the writer to have been, generally, the same *before* and *after* the Flood. Thus there is no room for the theory, which some have advanced, of the land and sea having changed places at the time of the Flood, or of the general geographical disposition of the earth having been different from what it is now. We do not refer, as evidence of this, to the ‘mountains of *Ararat*,’ mentioned in viii. 4, since it might be said that these may have first made their appearance, and received their appellation, *after* the Flood.

1148. G. vi. 19.

‘Of every living thing out of all flesh.’

These words are as general and comprehensive as possible; and evidently the ‘fowls’ and ‘creeping-things’ of v. 20 must be understood to include not only birds and reptiles, but creeping

and flying things of all kinds, worms, insects, &c. Otherwise, as has been observed already (1009), no provision is made at the Creation for the existence of these things, or at the Deluge, for the continuance of them; and a new and very extensive creation would have been required after the Flood, of which the Scripture tells us nothing. And, indeed, as we have seen, (1009), different kinds of locusts are expressly named among the ‘fowls,’ and the lizard and snail among the ‘creeping things,’ L. xi. 22, 30.

1149. How then could these snails, and worms, and snakes, and lizards, of all kinds, have found their way to the Ark, across vast countries, mountains, seas, and rivers, from the distant localities in which they lived? or how could they have *returned* to them? Every great continent has at this time its own peculiar set of beasts and birds; and these are known to have occupied the circles around these centres in ages long before that ascribed to the Deluge.

When America was first discovered, its indigenous quadrupeds were all dissimilar from those previously known in the Old World. The elephant, rhinoceros, hippopotamus, camelopard, camel, dromedary, buffalo, horse, ass, lion, tiger, apes, and baboons, and a number of other mammalia, were nowhere to be met with on the new continent; while, on the old, the American species of the same great class, were nowhere to be seen, such as the tapir, lama, peccary, jaguar, cougar, agouti, paca, coati, and sloth. BUFFON, quoted in Sir C. LYELL’s *Principles of Geol.* iii. 6.

1150. And most of these can live only in a certain zone of latitude, and perish, if suddenly transferred to an uncongenial climate. Could, the *sloth* and *armadillo*, from the tropical regions of South America, have marched up to the icy North, and so across the Behring’s Straits, and at length, after many years of painful wandering over field and flood, have been received into the Ark? and did they again, after the deluge, *travel back once more in like manner to their present abodes*?

1151. What again shall be said of the wingless bird (*apteryx*) of New Zealand, or the ornithorhynchus, wombat, and kangaroo, of Australia, which

are found nowhere else upon the globe? Many insects have no wings: many live but a few days, or even a few hours, after they have obtained their wings. How, then, could these have reached the Ark *before* the Flood? Or how, *after* it, could they have made their way to the distant regions of the earth, where they are now found, having crossed vast continents and oceans to do so?

1162. On this point Prof. OWEN says, *Annals of Nat. Hist.*, Feb. 1850:—

Had all the terrestrial animals, that now exist, diverged from one common centre within the limited period of a few thousand years, it might have been expected that the remoteness of their actual localities from such ideal centre would bear a certain ratio with their respective powers of locomotion. With regard to the class of Birds, one might have expected to find that those which were deprived of the power of flight, and were adapted to subsist on the vegetation of a warm or temperate latitude, would still be met with more or less associated together, and least distant from the original centre of dispersion, situated in such a latitude. But what is the fact? The species of no one order of birds are more widely dispersed over the earth than those of the wingless or struthious kind. Assuming that the original centre has been somewhere in the south-western mountain range of Asia, there is but one of the species of flightless birds whose habitat can be reconciled with the hypothesis. By the neck of land still uniting Asia with Africa, the progeny of the primary pair, created or liberated at the hypothetical centre, might have travelled to the latter continent, and there have propagated and dispersed themselves southward to the Cape of Good Hope. It is remarkable, however, that the Ostrich should not have migrated eastward over the vast plains or steppes which extend along the warmer temperate zone of Asia, or have reached the southern tropical regions; it is in fact scarcely known in the Asiatic continent, being restricted to the Arabian Deserts, and being rare even in those parts which are most contiguous to what we may call its proper continent—Africa.

If we next consider the locality of the Cassowary, we find great difficulty in conceiving how such a bird could have migrated to the islands of Java, the Moluccas, or New Guinea, from the continent of Asia. The Cassowary is not web-footed like the swimming birds; for wings it has only a few short and strong quills. How could it have overcome the obstacles, which some hundreds of miles of ocean would present to its passage from the continent of Asia to those islands? and, furthermore, how is it that no individuals have remained in the warm tropical southern border of Asia, where the vegetable sustenance of the Cassowary seems as abundantly developed, as in the islands to which the wingless bird is now exclusively confined?

If the difficulty already be felt to be great in regard to the insular position of the Cassowary, it is still greater when we come to apply the hypothesis of dispersion from a single centre to the Dodo of the island of Mauritius, or the Solitaire of the island of Rodriguez. How, again, could the Emeu have overcome the natural obstacles to the migration of a wingless terrestrial bird from Asia to Australia? and why should not the great continent of Asia have offered in its fertile plains a locality suited to its existence, if it ever at any period had existed on that continent? A bird of the nature of the Emeu was hardly less likely to have escaped the notice of naturalist travellers than the Ostrich itself; but, save in the Arabian Deserts, the Ostrich has not been found in any part of Asia, and no other species of wingless bird has ever been met with on that continent: the evidence in regard to such large and conspicuous birds is conclusive as to that fact.

In order that the Rhea, or three-toed Ostrich, should reach South America, by travelling along that element on which alone it is organised and adapted to make progress, it must, on the hypothesis of dispersion from a single Asiatic centre, have travelled northward into the inhospitable wilds of Siberia: it must have braved and overcome the severer regions of the arctic zone: it must have maintained its life, with strength adequate to the extraordinary power of walking and running over more than a thousand miles of land or frozen ocean, utterly devoid of the vegetables that now constitute its food, before it could gain the *northern* division of America, to the *southern* division of which it is at present, and seems ever to have been, confined. The migration in this case could not have been gradual, and accomplished by successive generations. No individual of the large vegetable-eating wingless bird, that now subsists in South America, could have maintained its existence, much less hatched its eggs, in arctic latitudes, where the food of the species is wholly absent. If we are still to apply the current hypothesis to this problem in Natural History, we must suppose that the pair or pairs of the Rhea that started from the highest temperate zone in Asia capable of sustaining their life, must have also been the same individuals, which began to propagate their kind, when they had reached the corresponding temperate latitude of America. But no individuals of the Rhea have remained in the prairies or in any part of North America; they are limited to the middle and southern division of the South American continent.

And now, finally, consider the abode of the little Apteryx at the Antipodes, in the comparatively small insulated patch of dry land formed by New Zealand. Let us call to mind its very restricted means of migration,—the wings reduced to the minutest rudiments, the feet webless like the common fowl's, its power of swimming as feeble. How could it ever have traversed six hundred miles of sea, that separate it from the nearest land intervening between New Zealand and Asia? How pass from the southern extremity of that continent to the nearest island of the Indian Archipelago, and so from member to member of

that group to Australia,—and yet leave no trace behind of such migration, by the arrest of any descendants of the migratory generations in Asia itself, or in any island between Asia and New Zealand?

1163. Again, it is obvious that the fish also in the rivers and fresh-water lakes must almost all have died, as soon as the salt-water of the sea broke in, and rendered them brackish. And, as the flood still increased, and the waters of the sea began to lose their saltness, the fish in the sea and the shellfish on the shore must also have perished.

So, too, a Flood, such as this must have destroyed, not only all animal life, but all *vegetation* also, from off the face of the earth. Of the innumerable species of known plants, very few could have survived submersion for a whole year; the greater part of them must have certainly perished.

Yet nothing is said in vii.21,23, about the destruction of either fish or plants: nor are we told of any new creation to supply the loss of these.

1164. On the contrary, an olive leaf is brought, plucked apparently fresh and green from a tree which had been eight or nine months under water, viii.11. The difficulty, that so long an immersion in deep water would kill the olive, had, no doubt, never occurred to the writer, who may have observed that trees survived ordinary partial floods, and inferred that they would just as well be able to sustain the Flood, to which his imagination subjected them. Of the enormous *pressure*,* that would be caused by such a superincumbent mass of water, he was, we may be sure, entirely ignorant. And, supposing that vegetable tissues may have power to adapt themselves rapidly even to such a prodigious increase of pressure, yet what would be the state of an olive-tree, after having been buried for months in water, some

thousands of feet deep, without its natural supplies of air and light?

1165. G.vi.19.

'Two out of all shalt thou bring into the Ark, to keep alive with thee; male and female shall they be.'

But there are many kinds of animals, which do not *pair*; but one male consorts with many females, as in a herd of *buffaloes*, or one female with many males, as in a hive of *bees*. Hence, while some of the animals in the Ark would be in the natural state, which was most proper for them, the condition of others would be most unnatural, if they were admitted two by two into the Ark. As NORR writes, *Types of Mankind*, p.73:—

Is it reasonable to suppose that the Almighty would have created [or preserved in the Ark] one pair of locusts, of bees, of wild pigeons, of herrings, of buffaloes, as the only starting-point of these almost ubiquitous species? The instincts and habits of animals differ widely. Some are solitary, except at certain seasons; some go in *pairs*,—others in herds or shoals. The idea of a *pair* of bees, locusts, herrings, buffaloes, is as contrary to the nature and habits of these creatures, as it is repugnant to the nature of the oaks, pines, birches, &c., to grow singly, and to form forests in their isolation. In some species, *males*—in others, *females*—predominate, and in many it would be easy to show that, if the present order of things were reversed, the species could not be preserved,—in the case of bees, for example. . . . It is natural to have one female for a whole hive, to whom many males are devoted, besides a number of drones.

1166. G.vi.21.

'And thou, take to thee out of all food which is eaten, and thou shalt gather it unto thee, and it shall be to thee and to them for food.'

We have noticed already (923.iii) that, in the Elohistic narrative, the creatures are to 'come' to Noah of their own accord,—impelled, we may suppose, by a Divine impulse, or by a foreboding sense of the great calamity which was impending, and he has only to 'bring them into the Ark,' vi.19; whereas, in the Jehovistic, he is to 'take them to him,' vii.2, and this seems to imply the writer's notion that he was to go out and gather them. But, however this may be, he is here commanded to 'take to him' *food*, for himself and all the creatures. And this, of course, implies that he or his must

* The pressure of a column of water 17,000 feet high, would be 474 tons upon each square foot of surface. This, however, would be the pressure of such a Flood, as that here described, at the ordinary *sea-level*; and olives would grow far above this. Still, even at the level of the *snow-line* of Ararat, the column of water would be 3,000 feet high, and its pressure 83 tons on every square foot of surface.

go out in person into all lands, and gather these supplies of food, and must know also the different kinds of food on which the different animals subsist.

1157. But what provision could he have made for the *carnivorous* animals,—for the lions, tigers, leopards, and hyænas, the eagles, vultures, kites and hawks,—and that for more than twelve months' consumption? How could he have supplied the otters with their fish, the chameleons with their flies, the woodpeckers with their grubs, the night-hawks with their moths? How could the snipes and woodcocks, that feed on worms and insects, in the bottoms of sedgy brooks, or the humming-birds that suck the honey of the flowers, have lived for a whole year in the Ark? And what would happen, when they were all let out of the Ark, and the predaceous animals turned, we must suppose, to seek at once their usual food? The loss of one single animal out of a pair would have been the destruction of a whole species.

1158. It is hardly necessary to estimate the *size* of the Ark, so as to compare it with that required for the reception of so many thousands of animals of all sizes, from the elephant and hippopotamus down to the shrew-mouse and the humming-bird, besides half a million species of insects, and innumerable snails, together with their food for more than a year. Nor need we stop to consider how Noah and his three sons could have brought together the materials for building this huge vessel, seven times as large as the Great Britain steamship,* and have built it, either with their own hands, or with the help of hired labourers, remembering with what expenditure of labour such a 'Great Eastern' must have been constructed. Nor need we argue as to the way in which, day by day, during this whole year, supplies of food must have been taken round, morning and evening, by the eight human inmates, to these tens of thousands of living creatures, shut up (apparently) without light or air, who must have needed

also to be furnished daily with water and fresh litter, their cribs being cleansed, and impurities removed,—though *how*, and *whither*, they could have been removed, are questions equally perplexing.

1159. Yet, if this ancient story is still to be put forward, and the people are to be required by high authority to believe that it is historically true,—as if this were necessary to salvation,—as if 'all our hopes for eternity,' 'all our nearest and dearest consolations,' depended upon our believing this,—such questions as these must be asked, till the fact is recognised that they cannot be answered.

In the next chapter we shall consider some of the arguments, with which the defenders of the traditionary view endeavour to maintain their position.

CHAPTER III.

THE FLOOD EXPLAINED BY TRADITIONARY WRITERS.

1160. BISHOP WILKINS, F.R.S. disposes of some of the scientific difficulties which are raised by the Scripture story of the Deluge, as follows, *Essay towards a real Character and a philosophical Language*, p. 163-6 :—

'Tis agreed upon as most probable that the lower story [of the Ark] was assigned to contain all the species of beasts, the middle story for their food, and the upper story in one part of it for the birds and their food, and the other part for Noah, his family and utensils. . . . As for the Morse, Seal, Turtle or Sea Tortoise, Crocodile, &c., these are usually described to be such kind of animals as can abide in the water; and therefore I have not taken them into the Ark; though, if that were necessary, there would be room enough for them, as will shortly appear. The *serpentine* kind, Snake, Viper, Slowworm, Lizard, Frog, Toad, might have sufficient space for their reception and for their nourishment in the drain or sink of the Ark (!), which was probably three or four feet under the floor for the standings of the beasts. As for those lesser beasts, Rat, Mouse, Mole, as likewise for the several species of Insects, there can be no reason to question but that these may find sufficient room in several parts of the Ark, without having any particular stalls appointed for them.

The carnivorous animals upon a fair calculation are supposed equivalent, as to the bulk of their bodies and their food, unto *twenty-seven Wolves*: but, for greater certainty, let them be supposed equal to *thirty Wolves*; and let it be further supposed that six Wolves will

* Ark, 550 ft. x 93 ft. x 55 ft.; Great Britain, 289 ft. x 41 ft. x 33 ft.

every day devour a whole Sheep. According to this computation, five Sheep must be allotted to be devoured for food each day of the year, which amounts in the whole to 1,825. Upon these suppositions, there must be convenient room in the lower story of the Ark to contain the fore-mentioned sorts of beasts, which were to be preserved for the propagation of their kinds, besides 1,825 Sheep, which were to be taken in as food for the rapacious beasts. And, though there might seem no just ground of exception, if these beasts should be stowed close together, as is now usual in ships, when they are to be transported for a long voyage, yet *I shall not take any such advantage*, but afford them such fair stalls or cabins, as may be abundantly sufficient for them in any kind of posture, either standing, or lying, or turning themselves,—as likewise *to receive all the dung that should proceed from them for a whole year*, [so as (we may suppose) to save Noah and his family from the necessity of cleansing daily the stalls. Alas! for the boa-constrictors and others of the serpentine kind, 'snakes, vipers, slowworms, lizards, frogs, toads,' condemned to live in the 'drain or sink' containing the whole year's drainage!]

1161. The learned Bishop then estimates that 1 Beeve = 7 Sheep, and that the total number of hay-eating animals = 92 Beeves,—'but,' he says, 'to prevent all kind of cavil,' say 100 Beeves = 700 Sheep,—and those eating 'roots, fruits, and insects,' = 21 Sheep. The carnivorous animals are reckoned, as we have seen, 'for greater certainty,' as = 30 Wolves = 30 Sheep. Thus the room required for *all the animals* preserved would be equivalent to 751 Sheep, while more than twice as much room would be required for the 1,825 Sheep alone, to be taken in merely as *food* for the carnivorous animals. And the food for these Sheep again would require nearly twice as much room as the food of the herbivorous animals; or rather, as the Bishop observes, only half this extra quantity of food would be required, as Noah and his sons would be butchering five Sheep daily, cutting them up, and distributing the pieces to the representatives of the 'thirty Wolves.'

1162. He has forgotten, however, to provide 'insects' for the swallows and ant-eaters. And HUGH MILLER, *Test. of the Rocks*, p.326, reckons that there were 1,658 known species of mammalia, 6,266 of birds, 642 of reptiles, and 550,000 of insects,—which numbers, of course, are being daily

increased with the advance of geographical science. But then, quite in the spirit of Dean GRAVES, and other 'reconcilers,' ancient and modern, Bishop WILKINS concludes with the usual stereotyped form of assertion, p.168 :—

From what hath been said it may appear that *the measure and capacity of the Ark*, which some atheistical, irreligious, men make use of, as an argument against [the historical credibility of portions of] the Scriptures, *ought rather to be esteemed a most rational confirmation of the truth and divine authority of it.*

1163. These, again, are WILLET'S views, *Hex. in Gen.* p.80.

(i) There were neither *four* rooms, or regions, in the Ark, as JOSEPHUS supposeth;

(ii) Nor yet *five*, as ORIGEN thinketh, the first for the dung of the cattle, the second for their food, the third for the cruel and savage beasts, the fourth for the tame and gentle, the fifth for man;

(iii) Neither were there, beside the three regions in the Ark, certain cabins without, in the side of the Ark, for the beasts called *amphibia*, that live both in the waters and upon the earth, as the crocodile, sea-calf, and such like, as HUGO thinketh; for all the beasts came *into* the Ark, which were preserved;

(iv) Neither, beside the three partitions in the Ark was there a bottom beside to receive the filth of the Ark, as PERERUS; for conveyances might be made otherwise in the side of the Ark for that use, and it would have been a great annoyance to have kept the dung of the cattle one whole year in the Ark.

All these opinions are repugnant to the text, which presented but three ranks, the lower, second, and third.

1164. As to the use of these chambers, WILLET writes :—

(i) Some make the lowest *for the dung*, the next for the food, the third for the cattle;

(ii) Some, the first for the beasts, the second room for their food, which might be put down into their cabins with ease;

(iii) Some will not have the cruel and tame beasts together, but make two several regions for them;

(iv) Some do place men and beasts together in the upper and third room, dividing it into three parts, having both the ends for the beasts, the middle for the men;

(v) Some do place the beasts together in the lowest,—which they make also the drain of the ship,—their food in the middle, and men together with the fowls in the uppermost;

(vi) It is most likely that the food and provender was in the *lowest* room, and the beasts in the *middle*, because of the fresh and more open air, as also for the better conveying of their dung by the sides of the Ark into the water. . . . Otherwise, if the cattle were in the lowest room, we must be forced, contrary to the text, to make a fourth place in the bottom, to be as the sink and drain of the Ark. . . . Neither was the door five cubits from the bottom, as PERERUS: but it was

placed lowest of all, for the more easy entrance of the beasts, which, being entered, might ascend by stairs and other passages to their cabins.

1165. If it be said that the opinions advanced by WILLET, A.D.1605, and Bishop WILKINS, F.R.S., A.D.1668, are now somewhat antiquated, yet the same views—the same in substance, though varying in details—have been maintained within the last few years, and are still maintained, by dignified clergy of the Church of England, as e.g. by the Rev. Sir G. MACGREGOR, Bart., 'Rector of Swallow, and Rural Dean, in his *Notes on Genesis, designed principally for the Use of Students in Divinity*, 1853, who writes thus, p.155:

*From this it follows that no genus, at least,—if not no species,—was lost in the Flood. Therefore those fossil land animals of extinct species, which we discover in the strata, must have existed anterior to the Adamic economy; and, therefore, the strata which contain them must have done so likewise. . . . God has often made the beasts subservient to man's purposes. At Creation, they came to Adam to exercise his powers of language. Here they came to Noah, to be included in the Ark. . . . This was as much a miracle as any of the foregoing, when the animals all came to Noah, two of every sort, for preservation. It does not seem likely that this included animal food, for animal food would not keep well in the Ark. Nor is it implied that more than two animals of a kind were in the Ark; therefore it was probably farinaceous or vegetable food. If so, this would agree with the notion that the *carnivorous* animals were originally created *herbivorous*, and were, in fact, *omnivorous*.*

1166. The 'Rural Dean,' it will be seen, purposes to relieve his 'Students in Divinity,'—that is, the clergy of the next generation,—from the difficulty of taking account of the 'thirty Wolves,' for whom Bishop WILKINS provides so carefully. Others, again, dispose of the whole question in another and much more summary way: e.g. the *Ecclesiastic* can still, in this age, ask seriously—

What difficulty can there be in accepting the hypothesis, which seems so likely, that these animals were further kept during their sojourn in the Ark in a state of torpor?—though in G.vi.21 Noah is commanded to 'take unto him of all food that is eaten,' for the *beasts*, as well as for himself, and though, on that hypothesis, the building of the Ark at all would have been unnecessary. It is clear that the writers describe it as built,

in order to keep the animals alive by natural means. If we are to introduce miracle for their preservation at all, why not let each animal go to sleep where the Flood found it, and be preserved in a state of torpor under the water? The omnipotence of the imagination is as competent to the one task as to the other.

1167. Some, again, have suggested, that it may have sufficed that only a very few primary *types* of animals should be preserved in the Ark, from which the numerous existing species have all been developed,—so that, for instance, from one single pair of *wolves*, preserved from the Flood, may have been derived all the different varieties of the *canine* tribe, dogs, wolves, hyænas, foxes, jackals, &c. But, without disputing the possibility of such development, yet, at all events, a great length of time would have been required for it. Whereas on the most ancient monuments of Egypt, of older date than the time of Abraham, we find depicted the wolf, hyæna, jackal, greyhound, bloodhound, turnspit, common dog, of 4,000 years ago, just exactly the same animals as now. See fig. 236–250, in *Types of Mankind*.

1168. WILLET writes on this point as follows, *Hexap. in Gen. p.87*:—

Neither came there of every kind of living thing, for these are excepted:—

(i) All that liveth in the water,—either wholly, or partly in the water, partly in the land; for such creatures only came which moved upon the earth;

(ii) Such creatures as come by *corruption*, not by *generation* (!), as *flies*, of the water,—*worms*, of dung,—*bees*, of bullock's flesh,—*hornets*, of horse-flesh,—the *scorpion*, of the crab or crevice [? 'cray fish,' or else *cérevise*, 'crab,']—*moths*, of putrefied herbs,—and certain small *worms*, of the corruption of wood and corn; for those creatures only entered, which increase by generation;

(iii) Such creatures are excepted, which are of a mixed kind, . . . as the mule.

1169. It may be well to quote here the words of the late HUGH MILLER, *Testimony of the Rocks*, p.335–339, who, however, while himself proving the impossibility of a *general* Flood, attempts, it will be seen, to show that Noah's Flood was not universal, but *partial*,—a point which we shall consider presently.

The Deluge was an event of the existing creation. Had it been universal, it would either have broken up all the diverse centres [of existing creation], and substituted one great general centre instead,—that in which the Ark rested; or else, at an enormous expense of miracle, all the animals, preserved by *natural* means by Noah, would have had to be returned by *supernatural* means to the regions, whence by means *equally supernatural* they had been brought. The sloths and armadillos,—little fitted by nature for long journeys,—would have required to be ferried across the Atlantic [after the Flood] to the regions [of South America, from whence also they had been brought before the Flood],—the kangaroo and wombat, to the insulated continent [of Australia], and the birds of New Zealand, including its heavy-flying quails and its wingless wood-hen, to the remote islands of the Pacific.

Nor will it avail aught to urge, with certain assertors of a universal deluge, that during the cataclysm, sea and land changed their places, and that what is now land had formed the bottom of the antediluvian ocean, and, *vice versa*, what is now sea had been the land on which the first human inhabitants of the earth increased and multiplied. No geologist, who knows how very various the ages of the several table-lands and mountain-chains in reality are, could acquiesce in such an hypothesis. Our own Scottish shores,—if to the term of the existing we add that of the ancient coast-line,—must have formed the limits of the land, from a time vastly more remote than the age of the Deluge.

But even supposing, for the argument's sake, the hypothesis recognised as admissible, what, in the circumstances of the case, would be gained by the admission? A continuous tract of land would have stretched,—when all the oceans were continents and all the continents oceans,—between the South American and Asiatic coasts. And it is just possible that, during the hundred and twenty years (?), in which the Ark was in building, a pair of sloths might have crept by inches across this continuous tract to where the great vessel stood. But after the Flood had subsided, and the change in sea and land had taken place, there would remain for them no longer a roadway; and so, though their journey outward might, in all save the impulse which led to it, have been altogether a natural one, their voyage homewards could not be other than miraculous. . . . Even supposing it possible that animals, such as the red deer and the native ox, *might* have swam across the Straits of Dover or the Irish Channel, to graze anew over deposits, in which the bones and horns of their remote ancestors had been entombed long ages before, the feat would have been surely far beyond the power of such feeble natives of the soil, as the mole, the hedge-hog, the shrew, the dormouse, and the field-vole.

Dr. PYE SMITH, in dealing with this subject, has emphatically said, that, 'all land animals having their geographical regions, to which their constitutional natures are congenial,—many of them being unable to live in any other situation,—we cannot represent to ourselves

the idea of their being brought into one small spot from the polar regions, the torrid zone, and all other climates of Asia, Africa, Europe, and America, Australia, and the thousands of islands,—their preservation and provision, and the final disposal of them,—without bringing up the idea of miracles more stupendous than any that are recorded in Scripture.' 'The great, decisive miracle of Christianity,' he adds,—'the resurrection of the Lord Jesus,—sinks down before it.'

And let us remember that the preservation and re-distribution of the land animals would demand but a portion of the amount of miracle, absolutely necessary for the preservation, in the circumstances, of the entire fauna of the globe. The fresh-water fishes, molluscs, crustacea, and zoophytes, could be kept alive in a universal deluge only by miraculous means. It has been urged that, though the living individuals were to perish, their *spawn* might be preserved by natural means. It must be remembered, however, that, even in the case of some fishes whose proper habitat is the sea, such as the salmon, it is essential for the maintenance of the species that the spawn should be deposited in fresh water, nay, in running fresh water; for in still water, however pure, the eggs in a few weeks addle and die. The eggs of the common trout also require to be deposited in running fresh water; while other fresh-water fishes, such as the tench and carp, are reared most successfully in still, reedy, ponds. The fresh-water fishes spawn, too, at very different seasons, and the young remain for very different periods in the egg. The perch and grayling spawn in the end of April or the beginning of May,—the tench and roach about the middle of June,—the common trout and pout in October and November. And, while some fishes, such as the salmon, remain from ninety to a hundred days in the egg, others, such as the trout, are extruded in five weeks. Without special miracle, the spawn of all the fresh-water fishes could not be in existence, *as such*, at one and the same time; without special miracle, it could not maintain its vitality in a universal deluge; and without special miracle, even did it maintain its vitality, it could not remain in the egg-state throughout an entire twelvemonth, but would be developed into fishes, of the several species to which it belonged, at very different periods. Farther, in a universal deluge, without special miracle, vast numbers of even the salt-water animals could not fail to be extirpated.

Nor would the vegetable kingdom fare greatly better than the animal one. Of the one hundred thousand species of known plants, few indeed would survive submersion for a twelvemonth; nor would the seeds of most of the others fare better than the plants themselves. There are certain hardy seeds, that in favourable circumstances maintain their vitality for ages: and there are others, strongly encased in water-tight shells or skins, that have floated across oceans to germinate in distant islands. But such, as every florist knows, is not the general character of seeds: and, not until after many unsuccessful attempts, and many expedients had been resorted to, have the more delicate kinds been brought

uninjured, even on shipboard, from distant countries to our own. It is not too much to hold that, without special miracle, at least three-fourths of the terrestrial vegetation of the globe would have perished in a universal deluge, that covered over the dry land for a year. Assuredly, the various vegetable centres or regions,—estimated by SCHOUWAT twenty-five,—bear witness to no such catastrophe. Still distinct and unbroken, as of old, either no effacing flood has passed over them, or they were shielded from its effects at an expense of miracle many times more considerable than that, at which the Jews were brought out of Egypt and preserved amid the nations, or Christianity itself was ultimately established.

CHAPTER IV.

GEN.VII.1-VIII.22.

1170. G.vii.4,12,17,viii.6.

The Jehovist here introduces the number 'forty,' which occurs so frequently in the subsequent history. Thus Isaac and Esau were each *forty* years old when they married, G.xxv.20, xxvi.34. *Forty* days were fulfilled for the embalming of Jacob, G.I.3. Moses was in the mount *forty* days and *forty* nights on each occasion, E.xxiv.18, xxxiv.28. The spies were *forty* days in searching the land of Canaan, N.xiii.25: the people wandered *forty* years in the wilderness, N.xxxii.13. So the land 'had rest' *forty* years on *three* occasions, Ju.iii.11,v.31,viii.28, and was 'delivered into the hand of the Philistines' *forty* years, Ju.xiii.1. Eli judged Israel *forty* years, 1S.iv.18: Goliath presented himself *forty* days, 1S.xvii.16: David and his son Solomon reigned each *forty* years, 1K.ii.11,xi.42: Elijah 'went in the strength of that meat *forty* days and *forty* nights,' &c., &c. From these instances, it is plain that the number was used in a loose, indefinite, sense, to express a large number; just as we find, among other oriental nations, the *forty* sources of Scamander, and the *forty* pillars of Persepolis.

1171. G.vii.19,20.

'And the waters were very, very, mighty upon the earth; and all the high mountains, that were under all the heavens, were covered. Fifteen cubits upwards the waters were mighty, and the mountains were covered.'

Here the waters are said to have covered the Earth to the height of (15 cubits =) 27 feet above the tops of the

highest mountains,—where, however, the density of the air, and, consequently, the temperature, would have been much the same as on the present surface of the earth, *while the Flood lasted*, since the effect of a *universal rise* of the waters would be to push out the air to a corresponding distance from the Earth's centre.

1172. But, when the waters had retired from the Earth, *i.e.* for at least *two* months, according to the story, the air would scarcely have supported respiration, and all living creatures in the Ark must have been frozen to death. For the story evidently supposes that the Ark rested on the highest mountain-summit; since it says that it 'rested on the *seventeenth* day of the *seventh* month,' viii.4, and the mountain tops were not seen till 'the *first* day of the *tenth* month,' viii.5, *i.e.* not till 73 or 74 days later. Now the highest summit of Ararat is 17,000 feet high, more than 1,000 feet higher than Mont Blanc (15,668 feet), and 3,000 feet above the region of perpetual snow,—*above* which, according to the story, they must have lived, from 'the *seventeenth* day of the *seventh* month' to the '*twenty-seventh* day of the *second* month,' viii.14, on which day they came out of the Ark—that is, for more than seven months.

1173. DELITZSCH describes Mount Ararat as follows, p.267:—

Mount Ararat raises itself in two high summits above the plain of the Araxes, Great Ararat to 16,000 feet, and Little Ararat about 4,000 feet lower. Great Ararat forms a pretty regular cone: its snow-field descends 3,000 feet from its summit, and its dark base, 10,000 feet high, forms a majestic pyramid, visible far off with its snowy crown. The eastern declivity is connected by a narrow ridge, like a neck, with the little Ararat, which shows a clear conical form. F. PARROT, who, as head of a scientific expedition, set on foot by the Petersburg Academy of Science, first made the ascent of Great Ararat, Sept.26-8, 1822, found a slightly-curved, almost circular, surface of 200 feet in circumference, which at the edge went down sheer on every side, covered with eternal ice, interrupted by not a single block of stone,—from which a wide panorama offered itself to the astonished gaze. On one of the summits of this mountain was Noah's landing-place, the starting-place of new humanity, spreading itself over the whole earth. [PARROT 'describes a secondary summit, about 400 yards distant from the highest point, and on the gentle

depression, which connects the two eminences, he surmises that the Ark rested.' SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, i.p.100.] There is no point of the old continent, which lies inland, and yet so truly island-like, surrounded by mighty waters. It is as if from these heights the water must run down on all sides. And there is no point of the old continent, which would have a position in so many respects central,—in the middle of the great African and Asiatic desert-track, in the middle of the greatest line of breadth of the Caucasian race, in the middle of the longest old lines of land, between the Cape of Good Hope and Behring's Straits, equally distant from the south point of Farther India and the north-west Spitzbergen Islands. This insular and central position of Mount Ararat, next to the peaks of Himalaya, the highest summit of the Old World, serves as a *surprising confirmation of the historical truth of the Biblical record* (!).

1174. But, further, the depth of water needed for a literal compliance with the story is *two miles* greater than the height of Ararat, and this would require, according to Dr. PYE SMITH'S estimate, about *eight times* as much water as is contained in all the seas and oceans of the Earth. Therefore, if all the water on the Earth were evaporated, and poured down as rain, the fact of the Deluge, as stated in the book of Genesis, would require a miraculous creation of this vast amount of water, and a *miraculous removal of it by natural processes*, viii.1-3, of which the Bible gives not the least intimation.

1175. Dr. PYE SMITH'S words are these, *Geology and Scripture*, p.140:—

The mass of water necessary to cover the whole globe to the depth supposed, would be in thickness about five miles above the previous sea-level. This quantity of water might be fairly calculated as amounting to eight times that of the seas and oceans of the globe, in addition to the quantity already existing. The questions then arise, Whence was this water derived? And how was it disposed of, after its purpose was answered? These questions may, indeed, be met by saying that the water was created for the purpose, and then annihilated. That Omnipotence could effect such a work none can doubt. But we are not at liberty thus to *invent* miracles; and the narrative in the Book of Genesis plainly assigns two *natural* causes for the production of the diluvial water,—the incessant rain of nearly six weeks,—called in the Hebrew phrase, the 'opening of all the windows of heaven,' *i.e.* of the sky,—and the 'breaking up of all the fountains of the great deep.' By the latter phrase some have understood that there are immense reservoirs of water in the interior of the earth, or that even the whole of that interior, down to the centre, is a cavity filled with water, a notion which was excusable

in the defective state of knowledge a century ago, but which, from the amplest evidence, we now know to be an impossibility. The use of this expression, in other parts of Scripture, sufficiently proves that it denotes the general collection of oceanic waters. It is scarcely needful to say that all the rain, which ever descends, has been previously raised by evaporation from the land and water that form the surface of the earth. The capacity of the atmosphere to absorb and sustain water is limited. Long before it reaches the point of saturation, change of temperature and electrical agency must produce copious descents of rain: from all the surface below, evaporation is still going on; and, were we to imagine the air to be first saturated to the utmost extent of its capacity, and then to discharge the whole quantity at once upon the Earth, that whole quantity would bear a very inconsiderable proportion to the entire surface of the globe. A few [about *five*] inches of depth would be its utmost extent. It is, indeed, the fact that, upon a small area of the Earth's surface, yet the most extensive that comes within experience or natural possibility, heavy and continued rain for a few days often produces effects fearfully destructive, by swelling the streams and rivers of that district. *But the laws of Nature as to evaporation, and the capacity of atmospheric air to hold water in solution, render such a state of things over the whole globe not merely improbable, but absolutely impossible.*

Dr. SMITH, therefore, endeavours to maintain the notion of a *partial* Deluge, which, as we shall presently see, the Scripture itself, as well as scientific considerations, will certainly not allow.

1176. However, geological facts are decisive against the possibility of an universal Deluge having ever taken place within recent ages of the world's history, — that is, within a period long antecedent to the time of the Creation, as narrated in the Book of Genesis. Not only are there no indications of such an event,—though if 'the fountains of the great deep' were 'broken up,' and the 'windows of heaven opened,' and the waters covered the Earth for a whole year, we should expect to find numerous and distinct traces of such a stupendous occurrence in former days; but the researches of Geology absolutely deny and disprove the fact of such an event having ever taken place.

1177. On this point KALISCH writes, *Gen.* p.208.

In the centre of France, in the provinces of Auvergne and Languedoc, are still the remains of several hundred volcanic hills and mountains. The craters, some of which are

higher than that of Vesuvius, ejected immense masses of lava to the heights of fifty, one hundred, and many more feet, and spreading over many miles of area. Distant periods separated the different eruptions. Distinct mineral formations, and an abundance of petrified vegetable and animal life, bespeak an epoch far anterior to the present condition of our planet. And yet, since these volcanoes ceased to flow, rivers have worked their way through that vast depth of lava; they have penetrated through basalt rocks one hundred and fifty feet in height, and have even considerably entered into the granite rocks beneath. The time required for such operations is immeasurably slow. Centuries are required to mark the least perceptible progress. The whole period, which was necessary for the rivers to overcome that hard and compact mass, is large almost beyond the conception of man; all our measures of chronology are insufficient; and the mind stands amazed at the notion of eternal time. That extraordinary region contains rocks, consisting of laminated formations of siliceous deposits; one of the rocks is sixty feet in thickness; and a moderate calculation shows, that at least 18,000 years were required to produce that single pile. All these formations, therefore, are far more remote than the date of the Noachian flood; they show not the slightest trace of having been affected or disturbed by any general deluge; their progress has been slow, but uninterrupted; even the pumice-stone, and other loose and light substances, with which many of those hills and the cones of the volcanic craters are covered, and which would have been washed away by the action of a flood, have remained entirely untouched.

1178. HUGH MILLER says, *Testimony of the Rocks*, p.341,342:—

The cones of volcanic craters are formed of loose incoherent scorice and ashes; and when exposed, as in the case of submarine volcanoes, such as Graham's Island and the Island of Sabrina, to the denuding force of waves and currents, they have in a few weeks, or at most a few months, been washed completely away. And yet, in various parts of the world, such as Auvergne in Central France, and along the flanks of *Ætna*, there are cones of long extinct or long slumbering volcanoes, which, though of at least triple the antiquity of the Noachian Deluge, and though composed of the ordinary incoherent materials, exhibit no marks of denudation. According to the calculations of Sir Charles Lyell, no devastating flood could have passed over the forest zone of *Ætna* during the last twelve thousand years,—for such is the antiquity which he assigns to its older lateral cones, that retain in integrity their original shape; and the volcanic cones of Auvergne, which enclose in their ashes the remains of extinct animals, and present an outline as perfect as those of *Ætna*, are deemed older still. Graham Island arose out of the sea early in July, 1831; in the beginning of the following August it had attained to a circumference of three miles, and to a height of two hundred feet; and yet in less than three months from that time the waves had washed its immense mass

down to the sea-level; and in a few weeks more it existed but as a dangerous shoal. And such, inevitably, would have been the fate of the equally incoherent cone-like craters of *Ætna* and Auvergne, during the seven and a half months, that intervened between the breaking up of the fountains of the great deep and the re-appearance of the mountains, had they been included within the area of the Deluge.

1179. Further, Mr. SCROPE says in his *Volcanoes of Central France*:—

This amount of excavation can be attributed only to the river, which still flows there; because the undisturbed and perfect state of the cone of loose scorice demonstrates that no denuding wave, deluge or extraordinary body of water has passed over this spot since the eruption. (p.97.)

The undisturbed condition of the volcanic cones, consisting of loose scorice and ashes, which actually let the foot sink ankle-deep in them, forbids the possibility of supposing any great wave or debacle to have passed over the country since the production of those cones. (p.206.)

It is impossible to doubt that the present valleys of the Loire, and all its tributary streams within the basin of Le Puy, have been hollowed out since the flowing of lavacurrents, whose corresponding sections now fringe the opposite margins of these channels with columnar ranges of basalt, and which constitute the intervening plains. Yet these lavas are undeniably of contemporary origin with the cones of loose scorice which rise here and there from the surface, and which would necessarily have been hurried away by any general and violent rush of waters over this tract of country. It is, indeed, obviously impossible that any such flood should have occurred. The time that must be allowed for the production of effects of this magnitude, by causes evidently so slow in their operation, is indeed immense. . . . The period, which to our narrow apprehension, and compared with our ephemeral existence, appear of incalculable duration, are in all probability but trifles in the calendar of nature. (p.207.)

1180. Lastly, Sir C. LYELL writes, *Ant. of Man*, p.192:—

We behold in many a valley of Auvergne, within 50 feet of the present river channel, a volcanic cone of loose ashes, with a crater at its summit, from which powerful currents of basaltic lava have poured, usurping the ancient bed of the torrent. By the action of the stream in the course of ages, vast masses of the hard, columnar basalt have been removed, pillar after pillar, and much vesicular lava, as in the case, for example, of the Puy Rouge, near the Cha'ucet, and of the Puy de Tartaret, near Neckers. The rivers have even in some cases, as the Sioule, near Chalucet, not only cut through the basalt, which dispossessed them of their ancient channels, but have actually eaten 50 feet into the subjacent gneiss; yet the cone, an incoherent heap of scorice and spongy ejectments, stands unmoled. Had the waters once risen, even for a

day, so high as to reach the level of the base of one of these cones,—had there been a single flood 50 or 60 feet in height since the last eruption occurred,—a great part of these volcanoes must inevitably have been swept away.

CHAPTER V.

WAS NOAH'S FLOOD A PARTIAL DELUGE?

1181. THERE are some, however, and as we have seen, HUGH MILLER among them, who endeavour to make it appear that the Flood in Noah's time was not universal, but partial. Not, however, that the difficulties already noticed, besides others yet to be named, will really be removed by this supposition. For it is just as inconceivable that the worms, and snails, and grasshoppers, should have crawled into the Ark, from different parts of some large basin in Western Asia (as HUGH MILLER imagines), as that they should have done so from different parts of the world. One small brook alone would have been a barrier to their further progress. Nor could Noah have provided for the wild carnivorous animals of those parts, which included the lion and leopard, the eagle and vulture. Besides, in such a case, what need would there have been to crowd the Ark with 'the fowls of the air by sevens'? G.vii.3,—since *birds*, surely, might have made their escape easily beyond the boundaries of the inundation.

1182. And so writes Archd. PRATT, *Scripture and Science*, p.55:—

The words of Scripture, were there no facts [of Science], like those I have mentioned, to modify our interpretation, would by most [?] persons, be understood as describing an universal flood of waters over the whole extent of the globe. *There would be no cause for questioning this and therefore no grounds of doubt.* [The words of Scripture, consequently, would be taken in their plain, obvious, meaning, as any simple-minded reader would understand them.] But, when the new facts become known, as they are at present, then [the words of Scripture must be *twisted* to meet them, or, as Archd. PRATT puts it.] the question is started, 'Does the Scripture language present any insuperable obstacle to this more limited interpretation?' That it does not, may be inferred from the fact that two of our celebrated commentators on Scripture, Bishop STILLINGFLEET and MATTHEW POOL, both in the 17th century, long before the discoveries of natural science required it, advocated this view (!). [Modern science has proved, by pointing to the hills of Auvergne,

that there certainly never was an universal deluge. But STILLINGFLEET and POOL, doubtless, felt some of the other insurmountable difficulties of the case as strongly as we do, and were tempted to 'twist' the Scripture accordingly, to suit the *facts* which 'required' it.]

And as to the *birds*, Archd. PRATT writes, p.55:—

A better acquaintance with the habits of many of the non-migratory birds will convince an objector, that even in a local deluge, of the extent which we suppose the Deluge may have attained, *many species* would have become extinct but for their preservation in the Ark, as the surrounding regions could not have supplied them. [But why, on this account, should *all* the birds, &c., within this limited district have been preserved in the Ark, since most of them existed also beyond its boundary?]

1183. But, surely, plainer words could hardly be used than the Scripture employs to show that the Deluge *was* universal:—

vi.7, 'Jehovah said, I will destroy man, whom I have created, from the face of the Earth, *both man and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air.*'

vi.17, 'Behold I, even I, do bring a Flood of waters upon the Earth, to destroy *all flesh, wherein is the breath of life, from under heaven, and everything, that is in the Earth, shall die.*'

vi.19, 'Of every living thing of *all flesh*, &c.

vii.4, 'Every living substance, that I have made, will I destroy from off the face of the Earth.'

vii.15, 'Two and two, of *all flesh wherein is the breath of life.*'

vii.19, 'All the high hills that were under the whole heaven, were covered.'

vii.21-23, 'And *all flesh died that moved upon the earth, . . . all, in whose nostrils was the breath of life, of all that was in the dry land, died. And every living substance was destroyed, which was upon the face of the ground, both man and cattle, and the creeping things and the fowl of the heaven. And Noah only remained alive, and they that were with him in the Ark.*'

See also viii.21, ix.11, 15.

1184. Archd. PRATT, indeed, refers to D.ii.25, as a proof that the expression 'under the whole heaven' may mean not the whole globe, 'but only Palestine and the countries in its immediate neighbourhood.' But, first, this is not the only expression, which is employed here to denote the universality of the catastrophe; and secondly, in the very passage quoted, the expression is plainly used to express *all* nations on the face of the whole earth:—

'This day will I begin to put the dread of thee and the fear of thee upon the nations that are under the whole heaven, who shall

hear report of thee, and shall tremble, and be in anguish because of thee.'

1185. It appears, then, to be impossible to doubt,—if only the expressions of the Bible are to be regarded, and not the incredibility, which in that case will attach to the story, as is freely confessed by such a well-informed geologist as HUGH MILLER, (1169.)—that the Scripture speaks distinctly of an *universal*, and not a *partial*, Deluge.

1186. However, let us suppose that the Deluge was *partial*, and that, instead of the *eight thousand* species of beasts and birds (1162), leaving out of consideration the reptiles, insects, &c.—only *eight hundred*—nay, only *eighty*—needed to be received into the Ark, and that, of these, *twenty* were species of clean animals, and *sixty* of unclean. Then the whole number of animals taken into the Ark would have been $20 \times 24 + 60 \times 2 = 400$. And now let any person of common-sense picture to himself what would be the condition of a menagerie, consisting of four hundred animals, of all kinds, confined in a narrow space, under these circumstances for more than twelve months!

1187. We must first suppose, of course, that Noah and his wife and children were occupied every day, and all day long, incessantly, in taking to these 400 creatures, two or three times a day, their necessary supplies of dry food and water, bringing fresh litter, and clearing away the old. But, shut up together closely in this way, with scarcely any light and air, is it not plain that, in a very short time, every part of the ship would have been full of filth, corrupting matter, fever, and pestilence?

1188. 'But the ship may have been kept clean, and the air pure, and the animals healthy, though shut up without light and air, by a *miracle*.' Yes, certainly: by multiplying miracles *ad infinitum*, of which the Bible gives not the slightest intimation,—which, rather, the whole tenor of the story as plainly as possible excludes,—if this is thought to be a *reverent* mode of dealing with Scripture, or at all more reverent than a course of criticism of the kind which

I am now pursuing, while thus endeavouring to set the plain facts of the case, in a clear, strong, light, before the eyes of the reader. I feel it to be my duty to do this, to the best of my power; nor ought I to be deterred by being told that I am treating the Bible with unwarrantable freedom, that I am using a 'vulgar' and 'coarse' kind of criticism, and delighting 'like a successful fiend' in dwelling upon the details of the sacred narrative.

1189. It is absolutely necessary that thoughtful persons should be called to look at these things from a practical every-day point of view,—that they should be induced to think for themselves about the details involved in the Scripture statements, and see for themselves that the notion of such a 'Flood' as that described in these chapters of Genesis, whether it be regarded as a *universal* or a *partial* Deluge, is *equally incredible and impossible*. If this be so, then it will also follow plainly, that, by believing ourselves, or teaching others to believe, in this account of 'Noah's Flood,' as a statement of real historical matter-of-fact, merely because the Bible records it as such, we shall be sinning against God and the Truth, and simply making an idol of the Bible.

1190. But, indeed, the waters of a Deluge, that could cover 'the high hills, that were under the whole heaven,' and the 'mountains' in Armenia, must have found their level on the surface of the whole Earth,—such a *partial* Deluge must have become *universal*,—unless the Law of Gravitation was suspended, by another stupendous miracle, for the space of twelve months.

1191. DELITZSCH observes on this point, as follows, p.260:—

The absolute generality of the Flood, if it was to be expressed at all, could not be expressed more clearly. It seems as if we must imagine the Flood to have covered the highest peaks of the Himalayas and Cordilleras, reaching to a height of 26,843 ft. [28,178 ft.] But r.20 makes that impossible: 'Fifteen cubits upward the waters were mighty, and the mountains were covered.' That can only be a concise datum from a particular stand-point; and this stand-point is in that case the Great Ararat, by far the highest mountain-summit of the neighbourhood, upon which the Ark grounded immediately after the highest state

of the waters. The Ark went 15 cubits deep; and so, at the moment when it grounded, the water also reached the height of 15 cubits over the top of Ararat. If this be so, then the statement in *v.19*, that 'all the high hills that were under the whole heaven' were covered by the waters, must not be understood literally in the sense of *universal*.

EBERARD contests the possibility of this, not only exegetically, but as a matter of fact. 'A partial flood,' he says, 'which reaches 15 cubits over the tops of even moderately high mountains, is a nonentity, an impossibility. A partial Flood is only conceivable in a basin, enclosed by mountains, and, even here, only then, when it does not reach the ridges of the enclosing mountains.' But this objection is not well-considered. It proceeds from the false supposition that the water could not form an irregular surface,—that it *could not assume a conical form* (!). But this is only true of standing water, which receives no supply. If, in the region about the Ararat, the supply from *beneath* was greatest in intensity, the Flood might go far above Ararat, without at the same time covering far distant mountains,—even low ones.

DELITZSCH, however, has not observed that the peak of his 'conical' mountain of water, rising 3,000 feet above the line of perpetual snow (1172), would have been converted into *ice*.

CHAPTER VI.

STORIES OF THE FLOOD AMONG OTHER NATIONS.

1192. MANY heathen nations have traditions concerning either an universal or a partial Deluge. These are given at length by KALISCH, *Gen.p.* 202-204. That, with which the Hebrew agrees most closely, is the Chaldean, as follows:—

The representative of the tenth generation after the first man was Xisuthrus, a pious and wise monarch. The god Chronos (or Belus) revealed to him that continual rains, commencing on a certain day, the fifteenth of the month Desius, would cause a general Deluge, by which mankind would be destroyed. At the command of the deity, Xisuthrus built an immense ship, 3,000 feet long and 1,200 broad; [and, having first as commanded, buried the records of the primitive world in Sippara, the city of the Sun,] he ascended it with his family, his friends, all species of quadrupeds, birds, and reptiles, having loaded it with every possible provision, and sailed towards Armenia. When the rain ceased, he sent out birds, to satisfy himself about the condition of the earth. They returned twice: but the second time they had mud on their feet; and the third time they returned to him no more. Xisuthrus, who had by this time grounded upon the side of some Armenian mountain, left the ship, accompanied only by his wife,

his daughter, and the pilot. They erected an altar, and offered sacrifices to the gods, but were soon raised to heaven on account of their exemplary piety. Those, who had remained in the ship, now left it also with many lamentations. But they believed that they heard the voice of Xisuthrus, admonishing them to persevere in the fear of the gods; after which they settled again in Babylon, from which they had started, and became the ancestors of a new human population. The ship was thought to be preserved in the highland of Armenia, in the mountain of the Cordyceans; and pieces of bitumen and timber, ostensibly taken from it, were in later times used chiefly as amulets.

1193. TUCH gives the following account of these myths, *p.137-154*, which is here condensed from Mr. HEYWOOD's edition of Von BOHLEN, *ii.p.161-184*:—

Many legends of a Flood are handed down to us from antiquity, which represent the inundation to have been in some cases a partial one, as in the Samothracian Flood, *Diod. Sic. v.47*, explaining geographical relations, and in other cases describe it as a general Flood over the whole Earth. [There is no ancient Egyptian legend of this kind, so that Egypt certainly was not the source of them.] Greece furnishes the accounts of two. In one, Ogyges survives a universal Flood, which had covered the whole surface of the Earth to such a depth, that he conducts his vessel upon the waves through the air. The other Grecian legend, which relates to Deucalion, is more complete, but, like that of Ogyges, is only narrated by *later* writers. Neither Homer nor Hesiod makes any mention of a Flood; and even Herodotus, though he mentions Deucalion, *i.56*, does not connect the name with any inundation. PINDAR first mentions Deucalion's Flood, *Olymp.ix.62-71*;* and it is given in a more perfect form by LUCIAN, *de Ded. Syr.xii,xiii*.† The object of

- * Man's first abode Deucalion reared,
When from Parnassus' glittering crown,
With Pyrrha paired, the Seer came down.
Behind them rose their unborn sons,
The new-named *laidy of stones*,
A homogeneous mortal throng.'

MOORE'S PIND.*i.p.94*.

The idea of the creation of human beings, from stones thrown behind them by Deucalion and Pyrrha, evidently originated in the similarity of the words *lâas*, 'stone,' and *lâso*, 'people.'

† 'I heard a story about Deucalion among the Hellenes, which the Hellenes tell about him. Now the fable is this. The present generation, the men now living, were not the first that came into being; but that generation all perished. These, however, are of the second generation, which a second time grew to great numbers after the age of Deucalion. But about that generation the story is as follows. Being thoroughly insolent, they did unlawful deeds; for they never kept oaths, nor entertained strangers, nor spared suppliants—for which things this great calamity befel them. All at once the earth poured forth

the Hellenic deluge appears to have been the annihilation of the brazen race, which according to HESIOD perished *without* any Flood. The race, which was destroyed, had acted wickedly, disregarded oaths and the rights of hospitality, attended to no expostulations, and in the end became necessarily punished. Jupiter sent violent torrents of rain, and the Earth, says LUCIAN, opened in order to let the immense body of water run off. Deucalion the *only righteous man*, entered the vessel which he had made, with his wife Pyrrha [LUC. 'with his wives'], and according to the later form of the legend, took with him different kinds of animals in pairs. After nine days and nine nights he landed on the summit of Parnassus, which remained uncovered, PAUS.x.6; * while the greatest part of Greece was laid under water, so that only a few men, who had fled to the highest mountains, escaped alive. PLUTARCH, *de Soli. Anim.*xiii,† mentions the dove, which Deucalion employed to find out if the rain had ceased or the heavens had become clear.

The Phrygian legend is similar, though we have only faint traces of it. Annakos, the Biblical Enoch, foretells the coming Flood; and coins of Apamea, of the time of Septimus Severus, A.D. 194-211, represent a floating vessel, in which a man and his wife may be discerned, whilst upon the vessel is a bird, and another is flying towards it, holding a twig in its claw. The same couple are seen standing on the dry land, with their right hands uplifted, and upon these specimens of the coin is the name ΝΩ. This Phrygian legend must refer in some degree to a Flood, and it settled the landing place of the Floating Ark to be near Apamea, which bears the name of 'Ark.' The close coincidence, however, with the Biblical narrative, even in the occurrence of the name of Noah (ΝΩ), excites suspicion, and favours the presumption that this representation of the coins was derived from the Hebrew.

The same fundamental ideas are contained in all these legendary narratives of the Flood.

much water, and much rain fell, and the rivers came down in floods, and the sea rose to a great height, until all became water, and all perished. Only Deucalion was left of men for a second generation, on account of his prudence and piety. And this was the way in which he was preserved. He embarked his children and wives in a large Ark which he had. And, as he entered, there came to him swine, and horses, and different kinds of lions, and serpents, and whatever else lives in the Earth, by pairs. And he received them all, and they did him no harm, but great friendship existed between them by the will of Zeus. And in one Ark they all sailed so long as the water prevailed.

* And of the people, all, who were able to escape the storm, were saved through the howling of wolves, by escaping to the heights of Parnassus, following the beasts as guides of the way.'

† 'Story-tellers say that a dove, sent out from the Ark, became a sign of tempest by returning in again, and of fine weather by having flown away.'

In every instance the legend was transplanted by the people who relate it to their own country. Himalaya, Ararat, and Parnassus, occupy the same place in one set of myths, as Meru, Alborz, and Olympus do in the others. The Hebrew legend alone removes it entirely from Canaanitish soil, because the Israelites constantly retained the conviction that they had *not* originally belonged to that country. The scene of their legend of the Flood was the original home of their national forefathers, which was to them an inheritance of primeval antiquity.

1194. The following lines are taken from Dean MILMAN's translation of 'The Story of the Fish,' in *Nala Damayanti and other Poems*, p.114-15, where Manu is represented as addressed by Brahma in the form of a fish, as follows:—

When the awful time approaches,—hear from me what thou must do.

In a little time, O blessed! all the firm and seated earth,—

All that moves upon its surface,—shall a deluge sweep away.

Near it comes—of all creation the ablution-day is near;

Therefore, what I now forewarn thee, may thy highest weal secure.

All the fixed and all the moving,—all that stirs or stirreth not,—

Lo! of all the time approaches, the tremendous time of doom.

Build thyself a ship, O Manu, strong, with cables well prepared;

And thyself, with the seven sages, mighty Manu, enter in.

All the living seeds of all things, by the Brahmins named of yore,

Place them first within the vessel, well secured, divided well.

Earth was seen no more, no region, nor the intermediate space;

All around a waste of water,—water all, and air, and sky.

In the whole world of creation, princely son of Bharata!

None was seen but those seven sages, Manu only and the fish,

Years on years, and still unwearied, drew that fish the bark along,

Till at length it came, where lifted Himavan its loftiest peak.

There at length it came, and, smiling, thus the fish addressed the sage:

'To the peak of Himalaya bind thou now the stately ship.'

At the fish's mandate quickly, to the peak of Himavan

Bound the sage his bark, and ever to this day that loftiest peak

Bears the name of Naubandhana, from the binding of the bark.

1195. We add here the following quotation from KENRICK, *Primeval History*, p.33:—

It must appear very doubtful whether the

earliest mythology of the Greeks contained any reference to a destruction of the human race by a Flood. But the coincidence of the Babylonian, the Indian, the Mexican, and the Jewish accounts, can hardly be explained, without supposing a very high antiquity of the Asiatic tradition, an antiquity preceding our knowledge of any definite facts in the history of these nations. . . . However high we may be warranted to carry up the existence of this tradition in Asia, it will not necessarily follow that it was founded upon a real fact. . . . There is abundant evidence that the past changes of the globe, and the fate of the human race as influenced by them, have excited the imagination to speculate on their causes and circumstances, and that these speculations, assuming an historical form, have been received as matter of fact. The Mexicans believed in four great cycles,—the first terminated by famine,—the second by fire, from which only birds and two human beings escaped,—the third by storms of wind, which only monkeys escaped,—the fourth by water, in which all human beings save two were changed into fishes; and to these cycles they ascribed an united duration of 18,000 years. It was a popular legend among the Greeks that Thessaly had once been a lake, and that Neptune had opened a passage for the waters through the Vale of Tempe. . . . The legend, no doubt, originated in a very simple speculation. The sight of a narrow gorge, the sole outlet to the waters of a whole district, naturally suggests the idea of its having once been closed, and, as the necessary consequence, of the inundation of the whole region which it now serves to drain. The inhabitants of Samothrace had a similar traditionary belief, that the narrow strait by which the Euxine communicates with the Mediterranean was once closed, and that its sudden disruption produced a Deluge, which swept the sea-coast of Asia, and buried some of their own towers. The fact of traces of the action of water at a higher level in ancient times on these shores is unquestionable. . . . But that the tradition was produced by speculation on its cause, not by an obscure recollection of its occurrence, is also clear; for it has been shown, CUVIER, *Rev. du Globe*, p.87, by physical proofs, that a discharge of the waters of the Euxine would not cause such a Deluge as the tradition supposed. . . . The inhabitants of Polynesia have a tradition that the islands, with which their ocean is studded, are but the fragments of a continent which once existed. In Greece, the continent of Lyctonia was supposed to have been split into the islands of the Mediterranean. The inhabitants of the western part of Cornwall have a tradition that the Scilly Islands were once united to the mainland, by a tract now submerged. In none of these instances does any historical fact appear to lie at the foundation of the tradition, even where, as in the case last-mentioned, it is not in itself improbable. If the tradition of a Deluge is more widely spread than any of these, so also are the phenomena on which it is founded. . . . The sand and shells,—which induced Herodotus to believe, ii.12, that all Lower Egypt, and even the hills above Memphis, had once

been covered by the sea,—had lain there for ages, before they drew his attention; and surely his was not the first reflecting mind that had speculated on their origin. . . .

If, from these marks of the action of water on the Earth the notion of a Deluge arose, it would not only include, as a necessary consequence, the destruction of all living things, but also the guilt of the race which thus violently perished. No principle appears more universally to pervade the legends of early times than that great calamities implied great guilt. At Mavalipuram, on the coast of Coromandel, the remains of several ancient temples and other buildings, now close to the sea, suggested the idea that a splendid city had been buried under the waters. Such a calamity must have been inflicted by the gods as a punishment for some enormous crime; and this was found in the impiety of the tyrannical king, the great Bali. According to another account, the gods destroyed it, because its magnificence rivalled that of the celestial courts: see SOUTHEY'S *Kehama*, xv. It was on account of the wickedness of the Atlantians that Jupiter submerged their island and drowned the whole race.

A similar tale is related of an island near China, the impious inhabitants of which thus perished, while their righteous king escaped. The remains of buildings, or rocks which fancy has converted into such, seen through the transparent waters near the margin of lakes, have very generally given rise to legends of the destruction of towns for the wickedness of their inhabitants. Dr. ROBINSON, *Trav. in Palest.*, ii.589, mentions a tradition that a city had once stood in the desert between Petra and Hebron, the people of which had perished for their vices, and had been converted into stone. SEETZEN, who went to the spot, found no traces of ruins, but a number of stony concretions, resembling in form and size the human head. They had been ignorantly supposed to be petrified heads, and a legend framed to account for their owners suffering so terrible a fate.

1196. How easily legends grew up in those days, through pious speculations, with reference to ancient facts or memorials, the real meaning and true history of which was unknown, or had long been lost, may be gathered from one which JOSEPHUS, *Ant.* I.ii., sets forth, as being quite as much a piece of authentic history, as that of the Flood itself or the Tower of Babel:—

Seth, when he was brought up, and came to those years, in which he could discern what was good, became a virtuous man; and, as he was himself of an excellent character, so did he leave children behind him, who imitated his virtues. All these proved to be of good dispositions. They also inhabited the same country without dissensions, and in a happy condition, without any misfortunes falling upon them, till they died. They also were the inventors of that peculiar sort of wisdom, which is concerned with the heavenly

bodies and their order. And, that these inventions might not be lost before they were sufficiently known, upon Adam's prediction that the world was to be destroyed at one time by the force of fire, and at another time by the violence and quantity of water, they made two pillars, the one of brick, the other of stone, and inscribed their discoveries on them both, that, in case the pillar of brick should be destroyed by the flood, the pillar of stone might remain, and exhibit those discoveries to mankind, and also inform them that there was another pillar of brick erected by them. Now this remains in the land of Siriad to this day.

1197. The ground of the latter part of the above legend may have been the fact of the existence of remarkable pillars, which are said to have been erected by *Sesostris*, king of Egypt, to commemorate his victories,—not by *S th*, son of Adam, and his descendants. And this part of the legend may have given birth to the former part, *viz.* that Adam made such a prediction. *HERODOTUS* writes of these, ii.106:—

As to the pillars, which *Sesostris*, king of Egypt, erected in the different countries, most of them are no longer in existence; but in Syrian Palestine I myself saw some still remaining.

1198. *DELITZSCH* observes, p.242:—

The legends about the Flood, which are found in different nations, have just as much their corrective in the Biblical record, as this has in them a proof of its historical value. In them are similar fundamental portions, which form the basis of the heathen legends, only mythologically coloured, and altered in such a way, that the moral significance of the event retires into the background, the locality of the place of settlement is brought as near as possible, the horizon of an universal Flood contracts itself more or less in national, special, interests, and the forms of national common-life are carried back into the antediluvian time. Nearest to the Biblical record stand the Flood-legends of the West-Asiatic circle of nations.

1199. So, *DELITZSCH* says, in *Persia*, *India*, and *China*, there is a second group of Flood-legends, peculiar to the countries of Eastern Asia. A third group is formed by the legends of the Grecian circle; and a fourth by the legends of nations lying beyond the intercourse of the ancient world, as the *Welsh*, *Mexicans*, *Peruvians*:—

The legend of the Mexicans and Islanders of Cuba agrees even as to the *dove and raven*, with the Biblical account. According to the legend of the *Macusi-Indians* in South America, the only man who survived the Flood, re-peopled the earth by *changing stones into men*. According to that of the *Tamanaks*

of *Orinoko* it was a pair of human beings, who cast behind them the fruit of a certain palm, and out of the kernels sprang men and women. . . . Also the legends of a general Flood, among the *Tabitians* and other Society Islanders, betray an Asiatic origin, as generally much in this group of people reminds us of India. The inhabitants of *Raiatea* show—as a proof that a flooding of the land once took place—the corals and mussels, which are found on the highest summits of the island.

1200. The inference, which *DELITZSCH* draws from the 'dove and raven' appearing in the mythology of Mexico and Cuba, *viz.*, that these legends are all most probably derived from one primeval historical fact, would be justified, if the other chief details of the story were found repeated in these legends. Otherwise, it might be just as fairly argued that the primeval fact involved also the changing stones into men, which appears so prominent in these South American legends, as well as in that of the Greeks.

1201. In fact we can account for the observed resemblance in one or other of these three ways:—

(i) The different legends *do* point to one common primeval fact; but, if so, the 'stones' must have formed a feature in it quite as much as the 'birds';

(ii) The legends of the new World may have been derived from those of the Old; but, if so, the American Indians must have had connection with the old mythology of *Greece*, which contains the 'stones' as well as of *India*, which has the 'dove';

(iii) The legend in each case may have arisen from the same cause, *viz.*, the inventive faculty of man, as he observed the circumstances with which he was surrounded, and pondered upon them.

1202. We have just read that the inhabitants of *Raiatea* produced, as a proof that a Flood of waters must have covered their country in former days,—

the corals and mussels, which are found on the highest summits of the island.

Probably, we have here the real solution of the question before us. The *Raiateans* were right in believing that the existence of the remains of these shellfish upon their hills was a certain indication that the sea had once

covered their land. But they attributed to some remote era in the history of their own people, what, as we now know from the teachings of Geology, may have happened vast ages—perhaps, even millions of years,—before man lived upon the face of the earth.

1203. It seems probable, then, that, in all these different nations, the discoveries, which were made from time to time of these remains of marine creatures, far away from the sea, and far above the sea-level, must have led to speculations upon the cause of these phenomena. And what account could be given of them, but that they were the result of some tremendous Flood, which covered the whole earth, and left these signs of its terrible violence upon the high mountain-tops, which were buried beneath the waters? In such a Flood all living things must have perished, except such as might have been saved by some kind of floating vessel.

1204. The legend, then, in each case would gradually shape itself, according to the special peculiarities of the people or country in which it originated: just as the discovery of huge bones of extinct animals, and the sight of the vast remains of ancient buildings, seem (1139) to have given rise in different countries to the legends about a race of primeval giants. It is quite possible also that, in certain cases, some actual fact, handed down by tradition from former days, may have helped to give a substantial basis to the legendary story. The Hebrew narrative, for instance, may have had a real historical foundation in some great Flood, which overwhelmed a considerable tract of country in the neighbourhood of Ararat; just as it is possible that, since the existence of man upon earth, the country of Lyonesse, between the Land's End and Scilly Isles, has been actually submerged, as the Welsh legend teaches.

1205. Thus the Scripture story of the Deluge may rest upon a reminiscence of some tremendous inundation of the ancient fatherland of the Hebrew tribes,—possibly, as Baron BUNSEN

supposes, resulting from geological changes, connected with the formation of the present Caspian Sea, mixed up with recollections of some more recent catastrophe in the lower plains of Mesopotamia, which are not unfrequently flooded by the Tigris and Euphrates, the latter of which rivers has its source in the Armenian mountains, and is swelled prodigiously, at times, by the melting of the snows. It is noticeable that these inundations take place in the *Spring*, when Noah's Flood also was at its height, which began with the autumnal rains in the middle of the *second* month (October), G.vii.11, and was at its height, at the end of 150 days, in the middle of the *seventh* month (*March*), G.viii.4.

1206. We have the following account of such a Flood in the plains of Bagdad in the month of *April*.

A remarkable Flood occurred in April, 1839, in Mesopotamia, when the Tigris and Euphrates were both out at the same time, and the greatest exertions were required on the part of the inhabitants of Bagdad, to prevent their city from being swept away by the inundation. . . . On April 21, Dr. BELL wrote to a relative that the water was high upon the ramparts of Bagdad, and six feet above the level of the city. As far as the eye could reach, nothing was to be seen, from the highest tower of the Mosques, but a great waste of waters, studded here and there with a few date-groves, which appeared like little islands; all cultivation in corn and garden-produce was completely destroyed. Thousands of square miles of country were at that time inundated, and numerous encampments of Arabs were drowned in the localities, where they had been accustomed to dig wells for a scanty supply of brackish water. So extensive, indeed, was the inundation, that the Euphrates steamer, under the command of Captain LYNCH, made long excursions across the newly-formed Flood. Nearly a third of Mesopotamia was under water. HEYWOOD'S VON BOHLEN, ii.p.178.

Dr. BELL further mentions the fact that the ferry-boats in use on the Tigris at the present day are still 'covered with bitumen'; *comp.*

'Thou shalt pitch it within and without with pitch,' G.vi.14.

CHAPTER VII.

GEN. ix. 1—ix. 29.

1207. G.ix. 3.

'Every creeping-thing that liveth, to you it shall be for food; as the green herb, I give to you all.'

DELITZSCH notes here, p. 271:—

Not as though men had not yet enjoyed the use of any animal food, but now first it is allowed to them; since, now that the fruitfulness of the ground and the nourishing power of its products have been diminished by virtue of the divine curse, iii. 17, v. 29, man required a more extensive and more strengthening nutriment.

But it rather seems that, whatever may have been the case (1094) with the Jehovist, the Elohist did *not* suppose that, before the Flood, animal-food was used, as he makes no provision of such food for Noah and his family during the twelve months in the Ark. And yet, as already noted (1017), even in the eating of *vegetables* by men, or *grasses* and *leaves* by animals,—nay, even in the drinking of water,—there must have been abundant destruction of animal life, as common observation, and, at all events, the microscope, teaches. And great numbers of fish live by suction, and cause thus infinite destruction of animal life.

As regards the curse, it may be observed that the Jehovist seems rather to regard the Flood as having produced an *alleviation* of toil, v. 29, viii. 21.

1208. G. ix. 4.

‘Only flesh, with its soul, its blood, ye shall not eat.’

This may either be a recognition by the Elohist, in the form of an express law, of a custom already existing in his time, of abstaining from the use of blood as food, or it may have been introduced with the view of checking and extirpating among the Hebrews the practice of eating raw meat, which, as KALISCH observes, is still customary among some tribes of Syria, as it is to a certain extent among the Zulus, but especially among the modern Abyssinians, who are said to eat raw steaks cut from the living animal: *comp.* 1S. xiv. 32.

1209. G. ix. 13.

‘My bow do I set in the cloud.’

The writer evidently intends to account in this way for the *first* appearance of the rainbow. This is the plain meaning of the language here used, which must be twisted to imply that, though the rainbow had often been *seen* before,—as it must have been, if

there was rain and sunshine together before the Flood,—it was then first, after the Flood, made the sign of peace between God and man. The writer supposes it was then first set in the clouds after the Flood.

1210. DELITZSCH notes as follows, p. 276:

It is plain that, in the writer's meaning, the rainbow now appears for the first time, although—and this requires to be especially noticed—only *that* rainbow, which is visible far off in the clouds of heaven, after they have discharged their burden of water. For the same phenomenon of refraction is also to be observed at a waterfall, and it shows itself at times in a dew-dropping mist. But first after the deluge, with the entrance of the (so-called) rainbow, entered also the natural conditions, which made possible the appearance of the rainbow, as a cloud-bow bending itself high and far away over the earth. The production of the rainbow through a co-operation according to natural laws, of air, and water, and light, is no proof against its origin and object as here described.

The Hindoos see in it Indra's weapon, [with which he discharged his arrows of lightning against the Asuras, the assailants of heaven, and] which he placed by his side, [as a sign of peace for men,] after his fight was ended. The Greeks named it Iris, [the daughter of Thaumias (*wonder*), VIRG., *Æn.* ix. 5, by Electra (*brightness*), the daughter of Oceanus, *HES. Theog.* 265,] ‘the messenger between gods and men,’ [or they deemed it the path by which Iris herself descended]. Among the Germans it is the great bridge made by the gods, connecting Heaven and Earth. . . . The Samoides call it the border on the mantle of Num, *i.e.* the Deity. According to still existing German folk-lore, golden coins drop from it, and, in the spot where it rises, there lies a golden key, or one finds hidden treasures. These and similar views, existing also outside of Israel, show that the knowledge of the origin and signification of the rainbow had travelled out of the house of Noah into the world of peoples, and had not yet quite died away, though overpowered and repressed by various, and, in part, contradictory imaginations.

1211. Surely, we must believe that these and similar views are merely the results of human speculation upon the origin, and attempts to explain the meaning, of this remarkable phenomenon. The Hebrew, however, is the most intelligent and beautiful of all these imaginings, and *true*, as beautiful. For it is true that God has set His bow in the heavens, as a sign of His goodwill to us. But He has done this from the time when He first created the light and the rain,—not then first after the Flood. All things beautiful in heaven and earth are signs of His loving-

kindness,—of His special favour to a creature like man, who is gifted with power to behold this and other manifestations of the glory and beauty of the universe, and with power also to reflect upon and realise their meaning, as messages of peace, with which our Father's Goodness cheers us. The very fact, that we have eyes to see the rainbow and rejoice in it, is a sign that we are children of God, that we share His favour, and are not an accursed race.

1212. The Elohist, then, was right, when he viewed the rainbow as a pledge of God's continuing care for man; though he has limited and narrowed its meaning, by connecting it thus with the story of the Flood. To the eyes of all mankind, the appearance of the mild hues of the rainbow *after* a storm is very soothing and refreshing. As DELITZSCH says, p. 277:—

Shining out upon the dark ground, which was just before discharging itself with lightning flashes, it images forth the victory of the Divine Love over the dark fiery Wrath. Caused by the effect of the sun's rays upon the gloomy mass of cloud, it is a figure of the willingness of the Heavenly to penetrate and work upon the Earthly. Outspanned between Heaven and Earth, it announces peace between God and Man. Overspanning the horizon, it shows the all-embracing universality of the covenant of grace.

1213. These metaphors may be multiplied to any extent, and they have their proper use, as imaginative expressions setting forth broken images of the great eternal truth before our eyes. But we must not forget that a rainbow may herald a tremendous *coming* storm, as well as illuminate the dark cloud that has passed.

And, indeed, HOMER speaks of it as a 'portent,' foretelling either war or winter-storms, *Il. xi. 27-28, xvii. 547-48*; and the Chinese also regard it as the prognosticator of calamity.

1214. We may fall back with a sure, quiet, trust on the firmer ground of the comprehensive fact just mentioned, that He, who has made the rainbow and other things so grand and beautiful, and has given us eyes to see, and hearts to appreciate, the beauty and glory of His works, has surely kind and gracious thoughts towards us. He would not mock a world lying under

the power of the wicked one,—a race, of whom (as some suppose) the vast majority are doomed to endless woe,—with these bright exhibitions of His Goodness: for 'as His Majesty is, so is His Mercy.' *Eccles. ii. 18*.

1215. *G. ix. 25*.

'Cursed be Canaan: a servant of servants shall he be to his brethren.'

The other descendants of Ham, according to *G. x. 6*, viz., the *Ethiopians* (Cush), the *Egyptians* (Mizraim), and the *Moors* (Phut), are not included with Canaan under this sentence of servitude; nor are the Babylonians and Assyrians, the descendants of Cush, *x. 8-12*, or the different offshoots of Mizraim, *v. 13, 14*, as the Philistines. Only Canaan is doomed to be a 'servant of servants to his brethren.' This Scripture, therefore, though so often appealed to for this purpose, gives not the least sanction to the notion, that the African races, generally—as 'sons of Ham'—are doomed to be slaves.

1216. Some explain the fact of the Canaanites alone being selected for this condemnation, by supposing that Canaan, Ham's youngest son, was the first to detect his grandfather's condition, and reported it scoffingly to his father,—though the Bible says nothing of this. DELITZSCH writes, p. 281:

Noah's curse lights on Ham, not in the case of all his descendants, but solely in that of Canaan, the youngest of them: the others receive neither blessing nor curse; and that, too, has its meaning in reference to the world's history. But is it, then, reconcilable with the righteousness of God, that for Ham's sin Canaan should be punished, and not in person merely, but in the entire body of his descendants? Noah looks through the innermost machinery of the actions of his sons: the development, proceeding from these acts as first beginnings, is spread out before his prophetic eyes. His curse attaches itself to the descendants of Canaan, in so far as the sin of their father became the type of their moral condition; and between them and their sin arises a chain of consequences, occasioned through their tribal extension and national unity.

1217. Supposing, however, that the Jehovist wrote in a far later age than the days of Moses, *e.g.* in Solomon's age, it would be obvious that these words contain no *prediction*, but rather,—like the 'Song of Moses,'—convey,

most probably, an actual description of the state of things when the writer lived. The history of Samuel, Saul, and David, exhibits several obstinate struggles with the tribes, whom the migrating Hebrews found in possession of the land of Canaan. And many more such struggles must have preceded those times. The story before us seeks to find a justification for the manner in which the Canaanites were subdued, and subjected, as we find they were, for instance, in Solomon's days, 1K.ix.20,21:—

'All the people that were left of the Amorites, Hittites, Perizzites, Hivites, and Jebusites, which were not of the children of Israel, their children that were left after them in the land, whom the children of Israel also were not able to exterminate, upon these did Solomon levy a tribute of bond-service unto this day.'

1218. Hence is explained the significant repetition of the fact, that Ham was the 'father of Canaan,' v.18,22. The vicious practices of the Canaanites are accounted for by their being supposed to inherit the shameless character of their progenitor. The other great Hamite nations, as the Egyptians and Babylonians, would in that case, probably, not be included with Canaan in the sentence of servitude, for the reason that, at the time when these words were written, there was no likelihood of those mighty nations being ever so reduced.

1219. G.ix.20.

'And Noah began to be a man of the ground, and he planted a vineyard.'

Von BOHLEN observes, ii.p.148:—

It is well known that the finest vines grow over the whole of the Caucasus, and frequently in a wild state,—so abundantly, indeed, that in some parts the trees throughout whole forests are covered with vines. ELPHINSTONE, *Kabul*, i.409. The Grecian mythology also transfers hither the scene of the legend of Dionysus (or Bacchus).

1220. G.ix.27.

'and (He) shall dwell in the tents of Shem.'

The true meaning of the verse seems to be, 'and He (Elohim) shall dwell in the tents of Shem,' i.e. though He shall bless and 'enlarge' Japheth, yet the Shemite race—that is, of course, more particularly, the Hebrews,—shall be His favourites, among whom He will dwell,—which the *Targ. Onk.* expresses by saying, 'He shall make His Shechinah

to dwell in the tents of Shem.' The Hebrew word, *shachan*, here employed is that used habitually to express Jehovah's dwelling 'in the midst of' Israel, E.xxv.8, xxix.45,46, N.xxxv.34, 1K.vi.13, &c., for which *yashav* is never used; and though the latter word is used occasionally with reference to Jehovah's dwelling in the Temple, 2S.vii.6, 1K.viii.13, &c., yet it expresses more properly His *settled abode* in Heaven, 1K.viii.30, 39, 43, 49, &c. The complete phrase, indeed, 'dwell in the tents of' Israel, is not used anywhere of Jehovah; but we find 'dwell (*shachan*) in the midst of the camps of' Israel in N.v.3. In Job xi.14 we read, 'Let iniquity not dwell (*shachan*) in thy tents,' whereas we have in 1Ch.v.10:—

'They made war with the Hagarites, who fell by their hand, and they dwell (*yashav*) in their tents.'

1221. If 'Elohim' be the subject of the verb, the meaning of the passage, as we have said, is obvious: 'Elohim will bless and prosper Japheth; but He will make His abode with His people Israel.' If 'Japheth' be the subject, it is not so easy to explain the allusion. *Targ. Jon.* has, 'His sons shall be proselyted and dwell in the schools of Shem.' But were the sons of Ham to be excluded from this privilege? Manifestly not: since the children of an *Egyptian* in the third generation might 'enter into the congregation of Jehovah,' D.xxiii.8. Still less can the words be explained of the reception of the Japhethites into the Church, as Augustine* and Jerome† understand them: since surely the enjoyment of *this* blessing would not have been limited to two-thirds only of the great human family.

1222. There *may be*, here, as some suppose, a reference to an introduction of Japhethites, by colonisation or conquest into the district which belonged properly, in the writer's view, to the sons of Shem. The words in this case are

* AUG. c. *Faustum*, xli.24: 'in the tents of Shem, i.e. in the Churches, which the Apostles, the sons of the Prophets have built.'

† JER. *Trad. Heb.*: 'in saying, 'and let him dwell in the tents of Shem,' he prophesies concerning us, who engage ourselves in the study and science of the Scriptures, now that Israel has been cast out.'

thought to imply that the descendants of Japheth should be so numerous, that there should be no longer room for them in their old locations, and they would overflow into those of Shem. But if so, our want of sufficient acquaintance with the details of Israelitish history makes it impossible to conjecture with any degree of confidence the circumstances referred to,—more especially, as we have not yet arrived at any definite conclusion as to the age, in which this Jehovistic passage was most probably written.

1223. Possibly, bodies of people of Japhetic origin, among whom are reckoned in x.2,4, the Cimmerians (*Gomer*), Scythians (*Magog*), Medes (*Madaï*), Thracians (*Tiras*), Greeks (*Javan*), including Hellas (*Elisha*), and Cyprus (*Kittim*),—some, perhaps, for trading purposes, others, it may be, forced on by the increase of population,—had settled in some parts of the land of Canaan itself, which was reckoned as belonging of right to the Hebrew tribes, and had been allowed to do so without opposition. It is not unlikely that, on the northern boundaries of Palestine, there was always a pressure from without: and we read in Is. ix. 1 of—

‘the land of Zabulon and the land of Nephthaliin, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles.’

In the time of Josiah, it is known, a formidable horde of Scythians over-spread Media, and almost all Asia. They then marched towards Egypt, and were diverted by presents from the King Psammetichus. Upon this they returned into Palestine; some of them plundered the temple of Astarte at Ascalon; others settled at Bethshan, in the tribe of Manasseh, which from them was called Scythopolis.

1224. Something of this kind may have happened in earlier days.

Or the reference may be to the fact that the Medes, *Japhethites*, lived in close contact with the Assyrians and Mesopotamians, *Shemites*, or to the founding of Greek settlements upon the coast of Asia.

Or, perhaps, the words may be meant to express nothing more than this, that

there was no bar to the existence of friendly relations between the Hebrews and the people of Japhetic descent, whereas a very different feeling was entertained by the former towards the Canaanites.

But, on the whole, we prefer to adhere to the view expressed above (1220).

CHAPTER VIII.

GEN. x. 1-x. 32.

1225. G.x.

In this chapter we have a very interesting record of the extent of the Jehovist's geographical and ethnological knowledge,—though it gives plain signs, of course, of the limited knowledge of the times. As DELITZSCH notes, p. 289:—

We cannot avoid the admission, that the horizon of the author of this tabular list of nations was only as wide as the relations of his time allowed. Hence it is explained why e.g. he leaves the Chinese unmentioned, who are probably named [?] in Is. xlix. 12, ‘and these from the land of Sinim,’ but who in the time of Joshua [? Solomon], in which we place the composition of the Table, were as yet unknown in Western Asia. They were not known either to the Egyptians, whose ethnographical knowledge, as the monuments indicate more and more clearly, was, in consequence of the conquering expeditions of the Pharaohs, surprisingly extensive, or to the Phœnicians, although their ships went westward, as far as Spain, and eastward, as far as India.

1226. We find here registered many names of countries, cities, and peoples, of which the writer had, doubtless, heard some rumour,—and especially, if he wrote in Solomon's days, through the closer intercourse which in that age existed between the people of Israel and the Phœnicians, 1K. v. 1-12, x. 22, and also the Egyptians, 1K. iii. 1, x. 28, 29. Many of them are named in Ez. xxvii. as having commerce with Tyre, e.g., Kittim, Elisha, Arvad, Elam, Lud, Phut, Aram, Togarmah, Dedan, Sheba, Raamah, &c., comp. especially, ‘Javan, Tubal, Meshech,’ named in the same order in G. x. 2, Ez. xxvii. 13.

1227. But about some of these he may have known little more than the bare name, or stories current among the common people. We have an instance of such popular talk in v. 9, in the case of Nimrod:—

‘He was a mighty one in hunting before

Jehovah: wherefore it is said, Even as Nimrod, the mighty one in hunting before Jehovah.

KNOBEL observes, *Gen.p.103*, that his account of nations—confines itself to Europe, Northern Africa, and Western Asia, and in particular reaches eastward only so far as to the people lying next beyond the Tigris. It includes, consequently, about the same extent of district as was covered by the commerce of the Phœnicians at the time of its composition; and we may assume that the ethnological knowledge expressed in it is in a great measure derived from the connection of the Hebrew with the Canaanite Phœnician people.

1228. No tribes are so fully described as those of Canaan, *v.15-19*. TUCH writes, *p.199*:—

In the plainest manner the *national* interest of the writer betrays itself in reference to the Canaanites, who, contrary to the actual relations, are derived from Ham, in order to exclude them from having anything in common with the Shemites, especially the Hebrews, for which preparation is already made in *ix.25*. While recognising in all these indications the *Hebrew*, who allows his feeling of interest to influence his combinations, we have at the same time gained a measure of the value of the whole Table, which, accordingly, together with much correct data, confirmed also from other quarters, delivers much, which rests upon special modes of explanation and private speculations; and we have through the Table itself no certain guarantee for any statements, where other ancient authorities leave us in the dark,—to say nothing of those which are contradicted by them.

1229. The nations of Eastern Asia are not mentioned at all, having probably been unknown, even by name, to the Jehovist, who, however, as already observed (1105), appears to have had some vague notion of the existence of distant Eastern nations, not reckoned among the descendants of Seth. In a later age, when these nations became better known, attempts were made to connect them with Noah through Japheth, whom Arabic * writers describe

as the *eldest*, not—as he is in the Bible—the *youngest*, son of Noah. Thus KALISCH writes, *Gen.p.236*:—

They relate that Noah gave him (Japheth) a mysterious stone, long preserved in the possession of the Mongolians, on which the holy name of God was written, and which furnished him with power to call down rain from the skies at his pleasure. They consider him as an inspired prophet, and as the ancestor of the Turks, and call him, therefore, Aboulturk; and they ascribe to him *seven* sons, by whom he became the sire of as many tribes or nations, the most celebrated of which are the Chinese, the Goths or Scythians, the Russians, and the Turcomans.

1230. Many names of peoples and places are here set down as names of individuals, such as Tarshish, *v.4*, Sidon, *v.15*, Ophir and Havilah, *v.29*. So Mizraim, *v.13,14*, which is merely the dual name of the Double Egypt, Upper and Lower, begets six sons, each of whose names is a Plural Proper Name, and evidently represents a tribe or people, *e.g.* 'Casluhim, out of whom came Philistim,' the Philistines. Thus the Arabs derive the Persians from *Pharis*, the son of Aram, the son of Shem, and the Romans from *Râm*, the son of Esau, the son of Isaac. From the occurrence of the above Plural Names and Patronymics it is plain that the writer was aware of the real nature of the account which he was giving,—that he himself did not *mean* these names to be taken as the names of individual men,—at least, not in all cases,—but wished to be understood as writing a *chorographic* description of the world as then known.

1231. KNOBEL writes thus, *p.106*:—

As the Greeks assumed the mythical person^s of Pelagus, Lelex, Hellen, Æolus, Dorus, Achæus, Ion, Tyrrhennus, Iber, Kaltus, Scythes, &c., as progenitors of the peoples of like name, so the Hebrews referred back the different nations to separate progenitors having the same names. This appears also from the signification and form of the names. They are partly designations of *countries*, [Cush, Phut, Havilah, Mizraim, &c.] which passed over from the countries to their inhabitants, and

* Some Rabbinical writers also make Shem to be the *youngest* son of Noah, upon these grounds:

(i) The order of the genealogy in G.x is (i) Japheth, (ii) Ham, (iii) Shem.

Ans. This appears to be thus arranged, in order to bring the family of Shem into connection with the account of his descendant Abraham, in the following chapters.

(ii) If Noah begat a son at the age of *five hundred*, *v.32*, and entered the Ark at the age of *six hundred*, *vii.11*, and yet Shem was only a hundred years old, two years after the Flood, *xi.10*, he must have been the *youngest* son, and Japheth the *eldest*.

Ans. It is plain that in the lists of G.v.xi, the ancestors of Abraham are, in every other instance, the first-born sons of their respective fathers,—(the Elohist knowing nothing of Cain and Abel),—and it is not likely that the case of Shem would be exceptional. Perhaps, it is merely meant in *xi.10* to mark Shem's age as a hundred at the time when the Flood began, two years after which he begat Aphaxad.

then are applied to the assumed progenitors,—partly plural names, [Kittim, Dodanim, Ludim, &c.], which do not suit the progenitors, as single individuals,—partly *patronymics*, [Jebusite, Amorite, Gergashite, &c.] which apply to races, not to single persons. In the last two cases, it seems almost as if the author himself had not thought of separate individuals as progenitors. Leaving out of consideration the derivation of the peoples, this list of nations is an historical document, for the nations brought forward in it are historical: their existence was the occasion of the author's composing his description, and his knowledge enabled him to do so. We need not be surprised at this, if we realise the relation of the Hebrews to the Phœnicians, and their comprehensive commerce.

And KALISCH adds, *Gen.p.235*:—

The Hindoos also connected all the nations, of which they had the least knowledge, with their own history. But they traced the other nations to illegitimate alliances with the different castes, and regarded them all as impure rebels.

1232. The word *Kēnahan*, 'Canaan,' *v.15*, means 'low,'* *i.e.* *Lowlands*, in opposition to *Aram*, 'high,' the *Highlands* of Syria. Mr. GROVE describes the district of Aram, SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, *i.p.98*, as—

the great mass of that high table-land, which rising with sudden abruptness from the Jordan and the very margin of the Lake of Gennesareth, stretches at an elevation of no less than 2,000 feet above the level of the sea to the banks of the Euphrates itself, contrasting strongly with the low land bordering on the Mediterranean, the 'land of Canaan,' or the 'low country.'

And he writes of Canaan, *Ib.*, *i.246*:

High as the level of much of the country west of the Jordan undoubtedly is, there are several things which must always have prevented, as they still prevent, it from leaving an impression of elevation. These are—

(i) That remarkable, wide, maritime plain, over which the eye ranges for miles from the central hills,—a feature of the country, which cannot be overlooked by the most casual observer, and which impresses itself most indelibly on the recollection;

(ii) The still deeper, and still more remarkable and impressive, hollow of the Jordan valley, a view into which may be commanded from almost any of the heights of central Palestine;

(iii) The almost constant presence of the line of the mountains east of the Jordan,—which from their distance have the effect more of an enormous cliff than of a mountain range,—looking down on the more broken and isolated hills of Canaan,—and furnishing

a constant standard of height, before which everything is dwarfed.

1233. The above is, beyond a doubt, the true meaning of the word as expressing the country. But the Hebrew writer has introduced a *person*,—Canaan, the son of Ham,—and given him eleven sons,* of whose names nine are tribal names, and one is the name of the ancient city, Sidon. The Canaanites were, in point of fact, the lowland tribes of that district, including more particularly the Phœnicians, who lived upon the coast, and who both called themselves Canaanites, and are so called in the Bible. Thus we read:—

Is.xxiii.11, 'Jehovah hath commanded concerning Canaan [=Tyre]';

Zeph.ii.5, 'O Canaan, land of the Philistines.'

So Sidon is named as the *firstborn* of Canaan, *G.x.15*; and, accordingly, in the lists of the aboriginal tribes, *E.iii.8,17,&c.*, the first place is always given to the 'Canaanite' in the stricter sense of the word, *i.e.* the Phœnicians.

1234. GESSENIUS says of the name Canaan, *Heb. Gr. p.8*:—

It is the native name both of the Canaanitish tribes in Palestine, and of those who dwelt at the foot of Lebanon, and on the Syrian coast, whom we call Phœnicians, while they are called *Kēnahan*, 'Canaan,' on their own coins. Also the people of Carthage gave themselves the same name.

The Hebrew tribes were originally Syrians, *i.e.* *Aramæans* or *Highlanders*. But probably, as we shall presently see, they were in reality kindred tribes with and spoke the same language as, the Canaanites or *Lowlanders*, whence the Hebrew language is called, in *Is. xix.18*, 'the (lip) language of Canaan.'

1235. In all probability, the nations in this chapter are, as KNOBEL says, *historical*,—that is, they had a real existence in the views of the writer, and are not, as some have supposed, in many cases, a mere fiction of his own imagination. There is, however, one point, in respect of which there is an indication of artificiality in the list, *viz.*, that there are exactly *seventy* national names given in this register, if we omit the passage about Nimrod,*

* So AUGUSTINE says, *Op. Omn.vi.p.501*, 'Why, however, the land was called 'Canaan,' the interpretation of this name explains: for 'Canaan' is interpreted to mean 'low.'

* So writes Mr. BEVAN, SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, *p.545*: 'It does not seem to have formed

v.8-12, which has some appearance of being a later interpolation, whether by the same or another writer,—(since five sons of Cush are given in v.7, and it is strange that the story should begin v.8, 'and Cush begat Nimrod,')—and which at all events is concerned with the acts of an individual person, and not with a tribe or people. This number 'seventy' may have reference to the 'seventy' souls of the House of Jacob, which came into Egypt, G.xlvi. 27: *comp.* also D.xxxii.8,—

'When the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when He separated the sons of Adam, He set the bounds of the people according to the number of the children of Israel.'

1236. But there are several discrepancies in this account, which show some uncertainty in the traditions, reports, or theories, on which the writer relies; and there are other points, on which it is at variance with the ethnological science of the present day.

Thus the names of Sheba and Havilah,—doubtless, the names of countries,—occur both among the sons of Ham, v.7, and the sons of Shem, v.28, 29; and again Sheba occurs among the grandsons of Abraham, xxv.3. There may have been two branches of each of these two tribes, one settled on the E. coast of Africa, the other in Arabia; and the first in each case may have been reckoned by the writer with the sons of Ham, and the other with the Shemites. But then the two branches of each name must really have been related to each other; they must have been both Shemitic, or both Hamitic. And so DELITZSCH notes, p.307:—

It is impossible for us to keep asunder the Cushite Sheba, x.7, the Joktanite Sheba, x.28, and the Abrahamite Sheba, xxv.3.

1237. But if so, then both Sheba and Dedan, who are reckoned together as grandsons of the Shemite, Abraham, xxv.3, must be connected with the Hamite Sheba and Dedan of x.7.

part of the original genealogical statement, but to be an interpolation of a later date. It is the only instance in which personal characteristics are attributed to any of the names mentioned. The proverbial expression, which it embodies, bespeaks its traditional and fragmentary character; and there is nothing to connect the passage either with what precedes or with what follows it.'

Again, Tarshish* (*Tartessus* in Spain), and Kittim (*Cyprus*), which are known to have been Phœnician settlements, are classed among the *Japhethites*, v.4, though Sidon or Phœnicia itself is placed among the *Hamites*, v.15.

The *Medes* also (*Madaï*) are separated as Japhethites from the probably kindred tribes of Asshur and Elam, who are reckoned as Shemites,—perhaps because the territory of the Medes was supposed to extend indefinitely towards the north.

* The Chronicler writes, 2Ch.ix.21,—'For the king's ships went to Tarshish with the servants of Hiram: every three years came the ships of Tarshish bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks,' to king Solomon. Here he has evidently meant to copy the corresponding datum in 1K.x.22:—'For the king had at sea a navy of Tarshish with the navy of Hiram: once in three years came the navy of Tarshish, bringing gold and silver, ivory, and apes, and peacocks.' But the writer in Kings speaks only of a 'navy of Tarshish,' i.e. a fleet of merchant-vessels, the phrase 'ship of Tarshish' having become proverbial for 'merchantman,' Ps.xlviii.7, Is. ii.16, xxiii.1, 14, lx.9, Ez.xxvii.25, from the great traffic which the Phœnicians had with Tarshish (or Tartessus) in Spain. The Chronicler, however, has understood the expression literally, and therefore writes of Solomon's ships going to Tarshish.

So we find in 1K.xxii.48, 'Jehoshaphat made ships of Tarshish to go to Ophir for gold: but they went not, for the ships were broken at Ezion-geber.' But in 2Ch.xx.36, 37, we read, 'And he joined himself with him to make ships to go to Tarshish; and they made the ships at Ezion-geber. . . And the ships were broken, that they were not able to go to Tarshish.' That is to say, the earlier writer says, very correctly, that Solomon built merchant ships at Ezion-geber, at the top of the Red Sea, to go to Ophir, on the SE. coast of Arabia: whereas the Chronicler says that Solomon made ships on the Red Sea to go to a port in Spain. Some commentators have attempted to 'reconcile' the difficulty by supposing Tarshish to be in Asia: but there is no real ground whatever for this: *comp.* Is.xxiii.6, Jon.i.3, from which it is plain that Tarshish was directly accessible from the coast of Palestine. Mr. TWISLETON writes, SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, iii.p.1440: 'The compiler of the Chronicles, misapprehending the expression 'ships of Tarshish,' supposed that they meant ships destined to go to Tarshish; whereas, although this was the original meaning, the words had come to signify large Phœnician ships of a particular size and description, destined for long voyages, just as in England 'East Indiaman' was a general name given to vessels, some of which were not intended to go to India at all. . . This alternative is in itself by far the most probable, and ought not to occasion any surprise.'

1238. On v.8-12 KALISCH writes, *Gen.p.255*:—

The whole import of this interesting passage has been perverted and contorted. The 'hero' Nimrod has been, [through a false interpretation of his name, as from *marad*, 'rebel,'] transformed not only into a giant, a tyrant, and a ravager, but into a rebel against the authority of God, into a proclaimer of wicked principles, teaching the docile people that they owe all their happiness to their own virtue and exertion, and not to the power and goodness of God,—that the Divine rule was an intolerable tyranny, which had inflicted a general Flood, but which they could for the future escape by gathering around one great centre, the tower of Babel. He was regarded as a hunter of men, as well as of wild-beasts; his very name is believed to imply impious revolt; he has been identified with the fearful monster 'Orion,' [called *Keshl*, 'fool' or 'knave,' Job.xxxviii.31.] chained in the expanse of heaven with indestructible fetters, to warn and to terrify; he was, among the later Arabic writers, the subject of incredible fables, which (it is asserted) are hinted at in these verses. And all this because Nimrod is here called a 'hero' and a 'mighty huntsman'!

1239. G.x.21.

'Shem . . . the father of all the sons of Eber.'

By 'sons of Eber (*Heber*)' are evidently meant 'Hebrews;' in other words, the writer here deduces from the name of an imaginary personal ancestor, as a patronymic, the appellative name, 'Hebrew,' which is most probably derived from *heber*, 'across, beyond, on the other side of,' and was applied by the Canaanites to the people of Israel, as men who had 'crossed over,' i.e. had come originally from beyond the Euphrates. Hence the LXX express the word 'Hebrew' by *περάτης*, 'one from the other side;' and exactly in the same way the natives of Natal speak of the thousands of fugitive Zulus, who have 'crossed-over' the boundary River Tugela into the British colony, for protection from their tyrannical kings, as *ahawelajo*, 'crossed-over.'

1240. Thus 'Eber' in this passage is not really the name of a man, but, as MR. BEVAN says, SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, iii.p.1545,—

represents geographically the district *across* (i.e. eastward of) the Euphrates. . . the country, which had been the cradle of their race, and from which they had emigrated westward into Palestine. *Ibid.*p.770.

The name 'Hebrew' is first used of Abraham, G.xiv.13. It is applied to his descendants only in the month of foreigners, G.xxxix.14,17,xli.12,E.i.16,ii.6,7,1S.iv.6,9,xiii.19,xiv.11,xxix.3, or when they are contrasted with foreigners, G.xl.15,xliii.32,E.i.15,19,ii.11,13,xxi.2,D.xv.12,1S.xiii.3,7.

1241. The Jehovist in this chapter has deduced the inhabitants of the countries with which he was best acquainted, (whether through extended intercourse with Egypt, Phœnicia, and the East, or through other means,) from the three sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. In Hebrew, the name Ham, *kham*, would be derivable from the word *khamam*, 'be hot'; but its real origin appears to be the native designation for Egypt, *kheni*, 'the black country,' — PLUTARCH, *χμια*, (whence 'chemistry,' 'alchemy,')—which it received from the colour of its soil.

1242. The name Japheth, *yepheth*, is supposed by some to be derived from *yaphah*, 'be fair, beautiful,' and to have reference to the light colour of the European nations: while *Shem*, means 'a name, renown,' vi.4.xi.4, and may imply the favour with which the Hebrew branch of the Shemites was distinguished by Jehovah, or more generally, the grandeur and fame, which, in the earliest historical times, was attached to the nations of Western Asia: *comp.* in modern Europe, 'la grande nation.' The Jehovist, however, in ix.27, connects the name Japheth with *pathah*, 'enlarge.' Some, as BUTTMANN, connect it with the Greek *Iapetos*. The Targ. Jer. upon G.ii.7, says that God created man 'red, black, and white,'—showing that the idea of a triple partition of mankind, according to colour, was current among the Jews.

1243. Those, who receive the Jehovist's account as a sufficient explanation of the origin of the different nations of antiquity, must be prepared to explain how such remarkable *permanent* differences in the shape of the skull, bodily form, colour, physiognomy, as are exhibited on the most ancient Egyptian

monuments,—where we see depicted the Mongol with his distinctive features, shaven except the scalp-lock on the crown, or else with long hair and thin moustache, and the Negro, black, flat-nosed, thick-lipped, woolly-haired, just exactly as now, the children even with little tufts of woolly hair erect upon their heads, (see *Types of Mankind*, p.252, fig.173,) with many corresponding peculiarities in other cases,—could have developed themselves so distinctly in the course of a few centuries, though no perceptible change has taken place in the negro face for 4,000 years to the present time. Nay, according to the Biblical accounts, the period allowed for the development of the physiological and linguistic differences in the races of men commences, not with Adam or even Noah, but with *Peleg*, in whose days mankind was dispersed, G.x.25; and *Peleg* was born (449) only 191 years before the birth of Abraham.

1244. On this point writes Dr. PYR SMITH, *Geology and Scripture*, p.353 :

We have no instance of a white family or community acquiring the proper negro colour, nor of a negro family losing its peculiarity, and becoming of a proper, healthy, North-European white, where there are not inter-marriages with fair persons, long continued in the favourable direction. This, I believe, must be admitted; and another fact of great importance must be added to it. The recent explorings of the Egyptian tombs and temples have brought to light pictures of native Egyptians, and of men and women of other nations, comprising negroes, who are distinguished by their characteristic form of face and their completely black colour. Some of these highly interesting representations are proved to be of the age of Joseph and earlier, and some, in which negro figures occur, are of the eighth century after the Flood. Assuming, then, that the complexion of Noah's family was what I ventured to suppose as the normal brown, *there was not time for a negro race to be produced by the operation of all the causes of change with which we are acquainted.*

1245. And so writes NOTT, *Types of Mankind*, p.58 :—

We are told of the transmission from parent to child of club feet, cross eyes, six fingers, deafness, blindness, and many other familiar examples of congenital peculiarities. But these examples merely serve to *disprove* the argument they are intended to sustain. Did anyone ever hear of a club-footed, cross-eyed, or six-fingered race, although such individuals are exceedingly common? Are they not, on

the contrary, always swallowed up and lost? Is it not strange, if there be any truth in this argument, that no race has ever been formed from those congenital varieties which we *know* to occur frequently, and yet races should originate from congenital varieties, which cannot be proved, and are not believed, by our best writers, ever to have existed? No one ever saw a Negro, Mongol, or Indian, born from any but his own species. Has anyone heard of an Indian child born from white or black parents in America, during more than two centuries that these races have been living there? Is not this brief and simple statement of the case sufficient to satisfy anyone, that the diversity of species now seen on the earth cannot be accounted for on this assumption of congenital or accidental origin? If a doubt remains, would it not be expelled by the recollection, that the Negro, Tartar, and Whiteman, existed, with their present types, at least one thousand years before Abraham journeyed to Egypt, as a supplicant to the mighty Pharaoh?

1246. It is impossible to assign with any degree of confidence the situation of many of the places or peoples here named. Some of them, of course, are well-known from the later history, while others have been identified with considerable probability from a comparison of their names, and of the order in which they are here enumerated, with descriptions which occur elsewhere in sacred or profane authors. Thus JAPHETH represents the nations of the north and west (in Europe and W. Asia), HAM, those of the south (in Africa and W. Asia), SHEM, those of the central parts of W. Asia,—comprising, probably, all those of which the writer had had some definite information, though it is not impossible that some may have been omitted or inserted, to make up the important number *seventy*. The Japhethites, being probably least known, are given only to *two* generations, the Hamites to *three*, the Shemites to *four* or *five*.

1247. Among these may be noticed—
GOMER, comp. Cimbri, Cymry, and his descendants—

Ashkenaz = the Germans (?):

Riphat = the Kelts (?), whom tradition connects with the *Rhippean*, now the *Carpathian*, mountains;

Togarmah = *Krim-Tartars* (?), or *Armenia*;

MAGOG = Scythians; Gog = *Khogh* (Indo-Germ.), 'mountain,' found in *Caucasus*, 'mountain of the Asi,' from whom *Asia* is named;

MADAI = Medes;

JAVAN = Ionians, on the coasts of W. Asia,

from whom are derived (contrary to the Greek tradition, which makes Ion the descendant of Hellen)—

Elishah = Hellas or (?) Æolians;

Tarshish = Tartessus, in Spain;

Kittim = Cyprus;

Dodanin = Rhodes, if the reading of the *Sam. Vers.*, *Rodanin* (as in 1Ch.i.7) is correct;

Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras (? Thrace) are very uncertain. Among the descendants of Ham and Shem are—

Lehabim = the Lybians;

Caphlorim = Cretans;

Arvadite = people of Aradus, an isle on the Phœnician coast;

Arphaxud = Arrapachitis, a district in Northern Assyria;

Hazarmareth = Hadramaut.

CHAPTER IX.

IDENTITY OF LANGUAGE OF THE HEBREWS AND CANAANITES.

1248. We proceed now to the consideration of the *language* spoken by the Hebrew tribes. According to the traditionary view, Hebrew must have been the language of Paradise, since all the conversations are recorded in that tongue,—the words of Jehovah-Elohim, those of Adam and Eve, and of the serpent, and, especially, the two names given by the man to his wife, ii.23, iii.20, names given with express reference to their meaning in Hebrew. So, too, after the expulsion from Paradise, the names are pure Hebrew: and Noah is made to play upon the name of Japheth. ix.27, with reference to a Hebrew root of like sound.

1249. Accordingly, there are some who have maintained that Hebrew was actually spoken in Paradise, and by all the inhabitants of the world before and after the Flood, without suffering any material modification, for 2,000 years (!), so that they remained still a people of 'one lip,' until, at the 'confusion of tongues,' the one primeval language was shattered into a variety of different languages, or, rather, a multitude of different languages were separated at that time from the parent Hebrew tongue,—which, however, was still maintained in its purity among the descendants of Peleg,—'in whose days the earth was divided,' x.25,—in the line of the eldest son till the time of Abraham. DELITZSCH, as we have seen (1034), cannot conscientiously maintain this view, but believes

that the transactions in Paradise were carried on in a different language, so that only broken reminiscences of what then took place have been handed down to us by tradition.

1250. But, however this may have been, we must suppose, it would seem, that Abramam, while living at Haran, xi.31.32, xii.4, 5, in his 'father's house,'—which is elsewhere described as the 'city of Nahor, in Mesopotamia,' xxiv. 10, comp. xxvii.43,—spoke the language of the country, the Aramaic. We are told, however, that when Laban, the grandson of Nahor, Abraham's brother, gave an *Aramaic* name to the stone set up by himself and Jacob, xxxi.47, Jacob gave to the same stone a *Hebrew* name of like signification. From this, regarded as an historical matter of fact, we should infer that Jacob spoke Hebrew, as his mother-tongue, *before* he left his father Isaac's house, and that he retained his command of that language during the twenty years of his residence in Haran, (where, of course, Aramæan was spoken by everyone else,) and adopted it again on his return to the land of Canaan.

1251. But this would show also that Abraham's family, while living in the land of Canaan, had already *changed* their language from Aramæan to Hebrew; and it is natural to suppose that they did this by adopting the tongue of the people among whom they dwelt. But, since the Hebrew and Aramaic are merely different forms of the same Semitic family of languages, this would imply that the Canaanites spoke the same tongue fundamentally as the Hebrews themselves, *before*, as well as *after*, the migration of Abraham,—in other words, that the Hebrew tribes were originally *kindred* tribes to those of Canaan, and were not, as they are represented in G.x, the sons of Shem, while the Canaanites were the children of Ham.

1252. By those who maintain Hebrew to be the original tongue of Paradise, or the nearest representative of the original tongue, it will be assumed that it was continued in its purity in the line of Abraham, while Aramaic was a deflection from it,—a dialectic variation.

Admitting this, the difficulty will remain the same as before, to account for the fact of the *Canaanites* and *Phœnicians* speaking Hebrew, or, at least, a language substantially the same as the Hebrew, *if* they were, indeed, descendants of Ham.

1253. That they did this, is clearly implied in the narrative, where the Hebrews are represented as having had no difficulty at any time in communicating freely, by word of mouth, with the aboriginal inhabitants of Canaan. In *Egypt* we find Joseph's brethren speaking with their brother, supposed to be an *Egyptian*, by means of an *interpreter*, xlii.23. The Hamite language of Egypt, then, was very different—as, of course, we know it was—from the Hebrew. But we find Abram conversing freely with the Canaanite King of Sodom and with Melchizedek, the Jebusite King of Salem, xiv.19–24,—(who, however, has been supposed by some to have been no other than the Patriarch Shem, and who, in that case, of course, would speak Hebrew, if that was the original tongue),—as also Lot with the people of Sodom, xix.5–9, Abraham and Isaac with the Philistine King of Gerar, xx.9–15, xxi.22–32, xxvi.7–10, 26–29, Abraham with the *Hittites*, xxiii.3–16, Jacob, with the *Hivites*, xxxiv.8–12.

1254. It may be suggested that these three Patriarchs had, perhaps, lived so long among the Canaanites, as to have acquired the power of speaking their tongue, supposed to be *Hamitic*, without having lost their own Aramæan, or that form of it, the Hebrew, into which it had become modified *among the members of their families*, who were originally, for the most part, also Aramæans. But then we find also the harlot Rahab in Jo.ii talking freely with the Hebrew spies, and the Hivites of Gibeon with Joshua, Jo.ix.6–13, and the man of Luz with the spies in Ju.i.24: so that these different natives of Canaan are represented as speaking a language substantially the same as that of the Hebrews.

1255. Again, the names of the Philistine King, *Abimelech*, G.xx.2, and of the Jebusite Kings, *Melchizedek* and *Adonizedek*, G.xiv.18, Jo.x.1, are pure

Hebrew,—meaning, respectively, 'father of the king,' 'king of righteousness,' 'lord of righteousness,' the last two being, in fact, identical. So the names of many of the Canaanite cities in Joshua,—*e.g.* 'Kirjath-sepher' = city of the book, Jo.xv.15, and see those in Jo.xv.21–62,—are pure Hebrew. Nay, in Isaiah's time, the Jews,—speaking *Hebrew*, of course, since their Prophets addressed them in that tongue,—did not generally understand the *Syrian* or *Aramæan* tongue, 2K.xviii.26, Is.xxxvi.11. Hence it is impossible to suppose that the Hebrew was merely such a slight modification of the Aramæan, as might have sprung up among the members of one particular family. And, in fact, we know that the two languages, though closely allied, are very different in form, and quite as distinct from each other, as Dutch from German, or Spanish from Portuguese; though, says Mr. TWISLETON, SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, ii.p.863,—

It seems to be admitted by philologists that neither Hebrew, Aramaic, nor Arabic, is derived the one from the other, just as the same may be said of Italian, Spanish, and Portuguese.

1256. In short, there can be no doubt that the tribes of Canaan themselves spoke substantially the Hebrew language, which the descendants of Abraham adopted from them, and which is therefore called the 'language of Canaan,' Is.xix.18. And so writes BLEEK, *Eint.p.*61:—

The geographical position also of Canaan, between the Aramaic and Arabian tribes, would lead one to assume beforehand that the Canaanites belonged to the same family of nations, and had a kindred speech, which, in respect of its character and dialectic peculiarities, would lie between the Aramaic and Arabian dialects, as in fact, the Hebrew does. That, however, the Canaanites—(that is, the people inhabiting the land before Abraham's arrival)—spoke one and the same tongue with the Israelites, or, at least, a tongue much more nearly related to the Hebrew than the Aramaic was, may be concluded from the fact, that, so numerous and intimate as were the relations of the Hebrews with these people, we find no indication whatever of any difference in their language, which either hindered them from mutually understanding one another, or made an interpreter necessary. Lastly, the Proper Names of Canaanitish persons and places are pure Hebrew, and expressed in Hebrew not Aramaic forms. It cannot be doubted, then, that the Canaanites

spoke substantially the same language as the Hebrews. But it cannot be supposed that they adopted it from the solitary stranger, Abraham. Hence it is obvious that he must have adopted it from them, after settling in the country, having dropped gradually by disuse the Aramaic dialect, which he spoke in his father's house. This language must the Israelites have taken with them to Egypt, and brought back again into the land of Canaan.

1257. But, beside the indications thus afforded, that the vernacular language of the Canaanites was substantially the same as the Scripture Hebrew, we have other positive proof in the case of the *Phœnicians*, who are spoken of as Canaanites in Obad. 20:—

'And the Captivity of this host of the children of Israel shall possess that of the *Canaanites* even unto Zarephath,' i.e. 'Sarepta, a city of Sidon,' Luke iv. 26.

So, in Matt. xv. 22, we read of the 'woman of Canaan,' who came 'out of the coasts of Tyre and Sidon'; and Sidon is named in G. x. 15 as the first-born son of Canaan.

1258. Accordingly, AUGUSTINE, speaking of the rural population of the Phœnician colony of Carthage, writes as follows, *Ep. Mch. ad Rom.* xiii:—

Our rustics being asked who they are, answering in Punic 'Chananites,' what else do they answer than 'Canaanites?'

So, *Hept. quest.* 16, he writes:—

Those tongues (Punic and Hebrew) do not differ much from one another.

And, *Tract. in Joh. Evang.* xv. 27:—

Those tongues are allied, and belong to neighbouring people, the Hebrew, and Punic, and Syrian.

And, *Locut. i. 24, ad Gen.* viii. 9,—

It is an expression, which I consider to be Hebrew for this reason, that it is also very familiar to the Punic tongue, in which we find many words agreeing with Hebrew.

And *contr. lit. Petil.* ii. 239,—

Which word (Messias) corresponds with the Punic tongue, as do very many other, and, indeed, almost all Hebrew words.

1259. But our actual knowledge of the ancient Phœnician tongue has been greatly extended of late, and leaves no doubt whatever on this point. It is derived from the following sources:—

(i) Words quoted by old authors as Phœnician or Punic, such as names of persons, places, &c., as well as many other words;

(ii) The passages produced by PLAUTUS,

Pœn. v. 1–10, li. 35, &c., as speeches of the Carthaginian Hanno in the Punic tongue;

(iii) Inscriptions on coins of the Phœnicians and their colonies;

(iv) Inscriptions on engraved stones and vessels, pillars, votive tablets, and sepulchral monuments;

(v) Especially the two very important, newly-discovered, Phœnician relics, viz. an altar of the fourth century B.C., discovered in June 1845, by the fall of part of a house in Marseilles, the ancient port Massilia, and the sarcophagus of the Sidonian king, Eschmunazar, with a very perfect inscription, discovered at Sidon, Jan. 15, 1855.

And for full proof of the substantial identity of the two languages reference may be made to the *Phœnician Inscriptions*, lately published by the authorities of the British Museum.

1260. Prof. RAWLINSON, however, *Aids to Faith*, p. 269, maintains that the Phœnicians were an entirely different race from the other inhabitants of Canaan, and were, in fact, *Shemites*,—so that they might speak the same language as the Hebrews,—while the Canaanites, generally, were *Hamites*:

As for the argument from the presumed identity of the Canaanites with the Phœnicians, though it has great names in its favour, there is really very little to be said for it. Phœnicia, as a country, is distinguishable from Canaan, in which it may, perhaps, have been included, but of which it was, at any rate, only a part. And the Phœnician people present in many respects a strong and marked contrast to the Canaanites, so that there is great reason to believe that they were an entirely different race.

But, if the Phœnicians were Shemites, what, then, becomes of the Scripture statement in G. x. 15, that Sidon was the 'first-born' of Canaan and brother of the Hittite, Jebusite, Amorite, &c.?

1261. Prof. RAWLINSON seeks to confirm his view, by noting—

Whereas between the real Canaanites and the Jews there was deadly and perpetual hostility, until the former were utterly rooted out and destroyed, the Jews and Phœnicians were on terms of perpetual amity,—an amity encouraged by the best princes, who would scarcely have contracted a friendship with the accursed race.

But he here only draws attention to another of the difficulties, which embarrass the traditional view. If the laws of the Pentateuch, as we now find them in E. xiii. 31–33—

'I will deliver the inhabitants of the land into your hand, and thou shalt drive them out

from before thee : thou shalt make no covenant with them, nor with their gods : they shall not dwell in thy land, lest they make thee sin against me :—

had really been in existence, and recognised as of Divine authority, in the days of David and Solomon, it can hardly be believed that these, among the 'best princes,' would have contracted such close alliance with the Phœnicians, who are expressly named in Ju.iii.3 among the nations of Canaan which were not yet exterminated, but 'left' for a while 'to prove Israel'—

'five lords of the Phillistines, and all the Canaanites, and the Sidonians, and the Hivites that dwelt in mount Lebanon,—

or that,—even if Solomon could import horses for the 'kings of the Hittites,' 1K.x.29, as well as take wives of the 'Zidonians and Hittites,' 1K.xi.1,—the prophet Amos, two centuries later, would have threatened the Tyrians with punishment, because they—

'remembered not the brotherly covenant with Israel,' Am.i.9.

1262. It is true that in Nehemiah's time, Neh.xiii.24, the speech of Ashdod differed materially, it would seem, from the Jews' language. But this was after their return from the Captivity, and when it is highly probable that their speech—at least, that of the younger people—had become considerably modified by so long a residence in Babylon. As BLEEK observes,—

We have no means of knowing certainly what the Jews' language was at that time, whether the old Hebrew, or the Aramæic (Chaldee) : nor do we know in what the difference consisted, perhaps, only in a broader utterance.

1263. The Semitic dialects are principally three,—

(i) The Northern or Aramaic, including the Chaldee, Samaritan, and Syriac ;

(ii) The Southern, including the Arabic and Ethiopic ;

(iii) The Middle, including the Hebrew, Phœnician, and Canaanitish.

These dialects wonderfully agree. By far the greater number of the root-words, which exist in Hebrew, are found in the other Semitic dialects, and with the same, or very little modified, meanings. But the Arabic appears to be by far the richest of these dialects, partly because we have so many books written in this language on all subjects, poe-

try, philology, history, geography, mathematics, and especially astronomy. The Arabic grammarians produce one thousand different words for 'sword,' five hundred for 'lion,' two hundred for 'serpent,' four hundred for 'misfortune.' BLEEK, p.42.

CHAPTER X.

THE HEBREW LANGUAGE, WHENCE DERIVED.

1264. It would seem, therefore, as we have said, that the language of the Canaanites and Hebrews was radically the same, from the earliest times, and that the former are incorrectly separated, as to their origin, from the latter, and referred to Ham as their ancestor. DELITZSCH, however, writes as follows, p.295 :—

The Semitic language of the Canaanites is not opposed to their Hamitic origin ; they have, as other Hamites, become *Semitized*. It is possible that they adopted the language of the primeval inhabitants of the future Canaan ; for, to judge from the remains of Proper Names which have come down to us, these were Semitic. It is possible also that, on their way from the East to the West, they dwelt long among the Semitic tribes of Arabia ; whereas the settlement of the primitive Egyptians was comparatively sudden, and therefore may not have been attended with any important intermixture with foreign elements. The old Hamitic tongues have certainly succumbed to Semitic,—at last, even in Egypt,—where the use and knowledge of the Coptic have almost entirely died out. *The inability of the Hamitic, and especially of the Canaanitish peoples, to maintain themselves in the possession of their natural tongue, corresponds to the absence of a blessing for Ham, and to the curse of servitude laid on Canaan.*

1265. It is obvious to reply that the Hamite Egyptians retained the use of their mother-tongue, long after the Hebrew had ceased to be the vernacular of Palestine. GESENIUS says (see PARKER'S DE WETTE, p.457) :—

This only is certain that, in Nehemiah's time, the people still spoke Hebrew, and that, in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees, the Hebrew was still *written*, though the Aramean was the prevalent language ; whereas, about this time, and shortly after Alexander the Great, even the learned Jews found it hard to understand difficult passages in the old writings, because the language had ceased to be a living speech.

1266. Again, NOTT writes, *Types of Mankind*, p.195 :—

It is no longer questionable, that the Gheez, or Ethiopic, idiom of the Ethiopic version of the Scriptures, and other modern books, which constitute the literature of Abyssinia,

is a *Semitic* dialect, akin to the Arabic and Hebrew.

'There is no reason to doubt,' says PRICHARD, 'that the people, for whose use these books were written, and whose vernacular tongue was the Gheez, were a Semitic race.' The Gheez is now extant merely as a *dead* language. The Amharic, a modern Abyssinian, has been the vernacular of the country ever since the extinction of the Gheez. . . . It is not a dialect of the Gheez or Ethiopic, as some have supposed, but is now recognised to be, as PRICHARD affirms, 'a language fundamentally distinct.' . . . It was, probably, an ancient *African* tongue, and one of the aboriginal idioms of the SE. provinces of Abyssinia. PRICHARD winds up his investigation with the following emphatic avowal, 'The languages of all these nations are essentially distinct from the Gheez and every other Semitic dialect.'

In other words, we have here the *Semitic* Gheez language becoming extinct, while the *African* or *Hamitic* Amharic is still spoken,—in contradiction to DELITZSCH's theory.

1267. It is, of course, impossible to disprove the assertion, that the whole body of Canaanites were Hamites, who once spoke the same language, substantially, as the Egyptians, but became Semitised, by dwelling among the (assumed) aboriginal Semitic tribes of the future Canaan, or by tarrying long among the Semitic tribes, through which they are supposed to have passed on their way from the eastern districts westward,—much longer than their brethren, the primary founders of the Egyptian race. But the assertion is supported by no evidence, and is altogether improbable.

1268. There appear to have been traditions, to which HERODOTUS, vii.89, refers, of the *Phœnicians* having been settled originally in the neighbourhood of the Persian Gulf, from which they migrated to the coasts of the Mediterranean. The *Philistines* also are expressed in the *Sept. Vers.* by a word which meant 'Foreigners' or 'Emigrants,' and are believed to have come back to the main land, from the Phœnician settlements in Caphtor, *i.e.* Crete, of whom the Deuteronomist writes, ii.23,—

'As to the Avim, which dwelt in the villages unto Gaza,—the Caphtorim, which came out of Caphtor, destroyed them, and dwelt in their stead.'

But the fact, (if it be a fact,) that the

Phœnicians had come originally from the Persian Gulf, would only make it more probable that they belonged to the Semitic family of nations, and spoke a Semitic tongue,—as did also, most probably, the other Canaanite nations, Hittite, Jebusite, &c., whatever may have been the case with the aboriginal tribes, whom they may have dispossessed.

1269. But we must here notice another point bearing upon the question of the Mosaic authorship of the story of the Exodus. That story represents the people of Israel, when coming out of Egypt, after a residence there of, at least, two centuries, speaking *perfectly pure Hebrew*, without the slightest intermixture of either Aramaic or Egyptian idioms. Moses, throughout the Pentateuch—and not merely in the later book of Deuteronomy—speaks to the people always in the purest Hebrew,—makes his addresses, writes his song, E.xv.1-18, and delivers his laws, in pure Hebrew; nay, the Ten Commandments, as recorded to have been uttered on Sinai, are expressed in pure Hebrew. Throughout the first four Books, with the exception of one or two Aramaean words, as Laban's expression, *yēgar shahādutha*, 'heap of witness,' G.xxxi.47, and one or two Egyptian words, as *avrech*, 'bow the knee,' xli.43,—introduced, however, with special reference to Aramaean or Egyptian circumstances,—the language is pure Hebrew, perfectly uncorrupted by Aramaean or Egyptian peculiarities.

1270. Now let us consider for a moment the circumstances under which this perfectly pure Hebrew of the Pentateuch is supposed to have been written. We find Jacob, as we have said (1250), on his return from Haran to the land of Canaan, returning also to the use of the Hebrew tongue, which we may suppose him to have been familiar with, as the language spoken in his father Isaac's house, during the first seventy-seven years of his life, and not to have lost, though he had but little opportunity of speaking it, during the twenty years of his sojourn with Laban. But his four wives, and all the servants, male and female, which

he brought with him into Canaan, must all have been Aramæans,—must all have spoken the same language as Laban, *viz.* the Syrian or Aramæan tongue; and we must suppose that the young children, of whom the eldest was not more than twelve years old, brought up with their mothers and these servants, must have spoken Aramæan also.

1271. We may, indeed, assume that during the *thirty* years which they spent in Canaan, before going down to settle in Egypt, they may have *changed* their language, as Abraham did, and, dropping the Aramæan, have acquired the Hebrew tongue of the tribes of Canaan. But it is not easy to understand how they should have changed it so completely, as to have lost all *trace* of the Aramæan, or how, going down into Egypt, as they did, and living there, under the circumstances described in the book of Exodus, for *two hundred and fifteen* years *at least*, they should have retained the Hebrew tongue, if they took it with them, in *perfect purity*, without the slightest intermixture of any foreign element. As to the first point, the captives in Babylon, we know, had their tongue soon corrupted, so that Chaldaisms abound in later Hebrew. But Jacob's family (we must suppose) exchanged the Aramæan for the Hebrew *completely* in thirty years, although for every one of those, who came into Canaan, except Jacob himself,—for all the adult women and servants, as well as the young children,—the Aramæan was their mother-tongue, which they had spoken from their birth.

1272. We will suppose, however, that Jacob's children, being so young, may have acquired the new tongue perfectly, through intercourse with Canaanites, as Hamor, G.xxxiv, and others. Thus Jacob himself, and his sons, and his daughter Dinah, may have spoken Hebrew, when they went down into Egypt. And, though his son's wives, unless taken from the Canaanites as Judah's, xxxviii.2, and Simeon's, xlv.10—(both these two, however, seem to be noted rather as exceptional cases)—would not have spoken Hebrew, we may

assume that *their* children, brought up among Canaanitish servants, may have learned from them and from their fathers, to speak the language of the land. And so the majority of the 'seventy souls,' who went down with Jacob, may be regarded as speaking Hebrew, though scarcely, we should suppose, *pure* Hebrew.

1273. But how could this small community of 70 souls, surrounded, as they were, by Egyptians, with whom they were continually in contact,—as friends, in the first instance, during the first *hundred* years of their sojourn,—as slaves, afterwards, for (at least) the last *eighty* years,—have maintained during all this time that perfect purity of language, which we find exhibited in the Pentateuch, uncorrupted by the slightest influx of Egyptian, or any other foreign, idioms? They may have intermarried among themselves, or taken wives from the Egyptians or other foreigners, or from their old Syrian home: but they could only have been reinforced, in respect of maintaining the *pure* Hebrew tongue among them, by marrying *Canaanites*. Some Hebrew women may have married Egyptians, 1Ch.ii.34,35, and their offspring would be reckoned as Hebrews: Moses himself married an Ethiopian woman, N.xii.1: a 'mixed multitude' went up with them out of Egypt, E.xii.38. The children and grandchildren of Joseph, we must suppose,—at least, during the 80 years of Joseph's dignity,—must have been brought up under Egyptian influences, and in intimate connection with the members of the high Egyptian family, to which Joseph's wife belonged, G.xli.45. And, indeed, the expression in G.l.23,—

the children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, were brought up on Joseph's knees,—

implies his close relations with them.

1274. Under these circumstances, during all this time, for more than two centuries, it would indeed be strange if they could maintain their language identically the same pure Hebrew, as that which their forefathers,—Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob,—spoke, while living in daily contact with the tribes of Canaan. It may, perhaps, be alleged

that the language of the Pentateuch is sufficiently explained, if Moses spoke and wrote Hebrew perfectly. Yet how should Moses,—who, for the first forty years of his life, was brought up in Pharaoh's house, 'in all the learning of the Egyptians,'—who may, of course, have spoken Hebrew, as well as Egyptian, but could only have learned it from the speech of his fellow-countrymen, when they had already been living in Egypt, under the circumstances above described, for 130 years to the day of his birth,—and who spent the next forty years of his life in the deserts of Midian,—have maintained all along the perfect Hebrew tongue, pure and simple, without the slightest adulteration from any foreign influences, neither vocabulary nor syntax being in the least degree modified?

1275. What effect the residence of 150 years in Babylon had had already upon the language of the captive Jews, notwithstanding the noble literature which they had among them, in the writings of their psalmists, prophets, and historians, may be seen, as we have said, in the numerous Chaldaisms, which distinguish the later Scriptures of the O. T. The natives of Natal, though they have lived only thirty years under European government, have already adopted many corruptions of English and Dutch words into their common language. Who can believe that the Hebrews, so small a community at first, only seventy souls, of whom many were mere children, and many others did not speak Hebrew as their original tongue,—and who at that time possessed no literature,—maintained their language amidst the joys of their prosperous, and the oppressions of their miserable, days in Egypt, without adopting a single idiom, or a single term,—even the name of a common article of food or dress, tool, implement, &c.—from the Egyptians, or from those with whom they may have intermarried, when they did not marry Canaanitish women? Did these foreign mothers not affect in the slightest degree the speech of their children?

It may be said, 'a special miracle may have been wrought for this.' But

wrought for what end? To maintain in its purity among the Hebrews the language—not of the primitive home of the Hebrew race, but—of the idolatrous tribes of Canaan!

1276. Upon the whole, the simple fact, that the Pentateuch is written in such pure Hebrew, appears to us a strong confirmation—if we do not press it, as a positive direct proof—of its having been written, not at a time when the tribes were just fresh from their long Egyptian sojourn, but *at a much later period of their national history, when the language of Canaan had become, after several generations, the common tongue of the invading Hebrews*, as well as of the heathen tribes, whom they deprived of their possessions in Canaan, and whom they were unwilling to acknowledge as brethren, although, it is plain, the language of the Canaanites belongs to the same group, as that spoken by the collateral branch of the Hebrew family in the 'city of Nahor.' Thus, in those later days, conversation is supposed to pass without difficulty between the Philistine garrison and Jonathan, 1S.xiv.12, and between the Philistine Achish and David, 1S.xxix. 6-10; and we do not read of any interpreter interfering in the colloquy between David and Goliath, 1S.xvii. 43-47.

1277. But what seems to demonstrate plainly the later authorship of one important passage, at least, of the Pentateuch, is this, that the prophecies of Balaam, who was 'brought from Aram, out of the mountains of the east,' N.xxiii.7, comp. D.xxiii.4, and who is represented as speaking in the ears of Balak, king of Moab, and of all the princes of Moab, 7.6, are expressed in the purest Hebrew. His conversation with the Moabite messengers, and with the ass, which also speaks and, apparently, understands Hebrew, may be supposed to have been modified, and to be merely described and reported in the 'language of Canaan.' But the prophecies, to be worthy of credence as historically true, must have been delivered in the form in which we now possess them, and in

which we have an *Aramaean*, speaking in the purest *Hebrew*, to a company of *Moabites*.

1278. By whom, it may be further asked, were these prophecies remembered, or written down, as Balaam uttered them, and by whom were they communicated to Moses? Is it not plain that we have here a grand composition of a later age,—‘profitable,’ no doubt, ‘for instruction in righteousness,’ but not to be received as an infallible record of historical matter-of-fact, involving the obligation of believing in the story of the speaking ass, or imputing the massacre of 68,000 Midianitish women and children to a direct Divine Command?

1279. What missionary, indeed, would not shrink from reading *either* of these passages, in the ears of an intelligent class of catechumens, as undoubted facts,—to the truth of which the Divine Veracity is pledged,—upon belief in which depend all ‘our hopes for eternity,’—of which to express any doubt or disbelief, is to shake ‘the very foundations of our faith,’ to ‘take from us all our nearest and dearest consolations’?

CHAPTER XI.

GEN. XI. 1—XI. 9.

1280. G. xi. 1.

‘And the whole earth was of one lip and of one language.’

The Jehovist—a person, evidently, of a very enquiring and philosophical mind, and, for the age in which he lived, singularly well-informed on geographical and ethnological matters—wishes, apparently, to account for the variety of languages, which he finds existing among the different families of the human race. He assumes that from the time of the Creation—for about 2,000 years—no diversities of language had yet arisen. Mankind was still of ‘one lip,’ and still spoke the same primeval tongue,—the Hebrew, we must suppose,—which was spoken by Adam, when he named his wife in Paradise, ii. 23. iii. 20.—by Eve, after their expulsion from Paradise, when she gave names to her sons,

Cain and Seth, iv. 1, 25,—by Lamech, shortly before the Flood, when he explained the name of Noah, v. 29. And, indeed, it is obvious that the names of the whole series of Patriarchs, from Adam to Noah, in G. v., and from Noah onwards in G. xi. 10–26, are, in almost every instance, *pure Hebrew* names.

1281. On the traditional view, then, we must suppose that Hebrew was certainly the primitive tongue. And so WILLET writes, *Hex. in Gen. p. 133*:—

Now, if any be desirous to know what language this was, which before this confusion of tongues was used through the world, it is agreed by the most learned interpreters, that it was the Hebrew.

(i) AUGUSTINE’S reason is, *de cir. Dei*, xvi. 11, xviii. 39, because the Hebrew is so called of *Heber*, in whose family that, which was the common tongue before, remained: that tongue, which Heber used before the division of tongues, was the common speech; but that was the Hebrew.

(ii) HIEROM’S reason to prove the Hebrew to be *matrix*, the mother of all other languages, [is] because every tongue hath borrowed some words of the Hebrew.

(iii) TOSTATUS’S reason is, because those names, which were first given, as Adam, Eve, Cain, Seth, are Hebrew words, as may appear by their several derivations in that tongue.

1282. DELITZSCH, however, as we have already seen (1034), finds himself unable to adopt this view, and writes as follows, *p. 315*:—

The Synagogues, the Fathers of the Church, and many of our orthodox teachers, are, indeed, of opinion that Hebrew was the primitive tongue, maintained in the family of Eber, the tongue already used before the Flood, the tongue of Paradise. It is said that Noah, (who overlived the event), Shem, and those of kindred mind, certainly took no part in the godless undertaking, and, consequently, were not affected by the ‘confusion of tongues.’ Reference also is made to the names of the primeval history, with some of which the derivations are given, as ‘Adam,’ ‘Isah’=woman, ‘Khavvah’=Eve, ‘Kain,’ &c. But both these arguments want convincing power. The family, from which Abram proceeded, was certainly an *Aramaic*, not a Hebrew, family; it was a family speaking *Aramaic*, as the history of Jacob and Laban shows, G. xxxi. 47, comp. D. xxvi. 5. ‘The Hebrew language,’ says ASTRUC, and his view is incontestably correct,—‘was the common language of the Canaanites; and Abraham, when he arrived among them from Chaldæa, needed to learn it, which was not difficult for him, because the language of the Chaldeans, which was his natural tongue, had considerable affinity with it, and was a sort of dialect of it.’ Hence the assertion of Arabic and Persian writers, that the Syriac or Nabataean tongue,—that which, after the confusion of

tongues, was maintained at Babylon itself,—was the primitive tongue, is comparatively more probable. However, dialects are branches which imply a common stem. We should, therefore, in place of Hebrew or Aramaic, have to assume the existence of a Semitic fundamental language, which later, though at a very early age, branched into dialects. But in opposition to this stands the fact that the Semitic family of languages, setting aside its peculiar honours, is inferior to others, as the Indo-Germanic, in richness and expressiveness, and does not by any means possess the completeness which must have belonged to the primitive tongue,—as also the fact, that the family from whom Abraham proceeded, had fallen away to idolatries just as the others, Jo. xxiv. 2, 14, and that the so-called 'Hebrew,' which we should rather call 'Canaanite,' Is. xix. 18, although, as a sacred tongue, it has had a very peculiar course of development, appears originally as the language of Canaan, the curse-laden, to whom it had passed from the equally-heathen aboriginal inhabitants of the land.

Also, the proof drawn from the names of the primeval history so little avails, that, in point of fact, the ante-Babylonian language cannot possibly have been the language of Paradise. Adam says in Dante, *Par.* xxvi. 124-6:—

The speech, which once I spoke, was quite extinct,

Before that to th' impracticable work

The race of Nimrod set their energies.

How can it possibly have been otherwise? Certainly, the principle of the 'dispersion' was first *powerfully energetic* after the event in G. xi. 1-9. But the Fall of Man must have changed their mode of *speech* as well as *thought*: it brought among them ever-spreading loss of spirituality, materialisation, and—since the nature of sin is false—self-seeking, the destruction of their unity, though, perhaps, at first, not yet to the extent of losing the power of mutual intelligence. 'The first man,' as DRECHSLER thence justly infers, 'was not called Adam, nor the first woman Eve, nor their sons Cain and Abel; only they are so-called in Hebrew; their names are all *true*, but only *relatively* true. With the occurrence of G. xi. 1-9, the names of the old traditionary history degenerated also in, and with, the general language, without any damage thereby to the authenticity of these names and their etymologies; since it is the same thing, for example, whether I say that Adam's firstborn had a name, which corresponds to the name *Kain*, from *Kanah*, 'acquire,' or to the Greek name *ktēsis* from the Greek word for 'acquire.' The veracity of the Law, which imparts to us here the tradition, viewed in the light of the spirit, which was inherited to Abraham and Israel, through Shem from the family of Noah, is not a verbal, but a living, veracity,—it stands not in the letter, but in the spirit.' So it is. . . . The derivation of all languages from one primeval tongue we hold fast upon the authority of the Scripture. But the possibility of demonstrating such a primeval language, out of a more or less close relationship of all existing

tongues,—this possibility, before maintained by us, we now dismiss, as though awakened from a dream.

1283. It is manifest that DELITZSCH's great difficulty is this—to account for the fact that the primeval Hebrew tongue, spoken in Paradise, and by all before the Flood, and in Noah's family after it, should have been retained amidst the 'curse-laden' tribes of Canaan, and not in the family of Abraham,—so that the latter must actually first have learned it, when he came into contact with them. Not being able to allow the possibility of this, he falls back upon the notion that the names, Adam, Eve, Cain, Abel, Nod, Noah, &c., are all *translations* of the original forms, into words of similar meaning in Hebrew,—a theory, which requires also to be swelled by the assumption, that all the conversations, recorded in G. i. 1-xi. 9, are only translations, and that all the names in G. v are, in like manner, modified from the original forms into pure Hebrew words, expressing literally the same meaning, and not only these, but also the names in G. xi. 10-25, at least, till we come to Peleg, in whose time 'the earth was divided.'

1284. The extravagance of these assumptions, to which this able writer has been driven in attempting to maintain the traditionary view, makes it unnecessary to discuss them at further length. It is sufficient to remark that, if the authority of Scripture may prove the fact of the existence of a primeval language, it will also prove that this language was Hebrew. We have no right to assume a process of translation, to which the original documents make no allusion.

1285. KALISCH notes on this point as follows, *Gen.* p. 318 :—

The linguistic researches of modern times have more and more confirmed the theory of one primitive *Asiatic* language, gradually developed into various modifications by external agencies and influences. Formerly, the Hebrew tongue was, by many scholars, advocated as the original idiom: for it was maintained, both by early Jewish and Christian authorities, that, as the race of Shem were no partners in the impious work of the Tower, they remained in possession of the first language, which the fathers of the earliest age had left to Noah. But this view,—like the

more recent one, that a child, if left alone without human society, would speak Hebrew,—is now classed among popular errors. At present, the scale of probability inclines more to the Sanscrit, although the disquisition is far from being concluded or settled.

According to Prof. MAX MÜLLER and Baron BUNSEN, the Sanscrit and Semitic tongues are alike modifications of an 'agglutinative' language, that is, of a form of speech in which the original compound roots had not been rubbed down into affixes and suffixes.

1286. But KALISCH's observation applies only to the different languages of one race, as the Caucasian or the Mongolian. No one would say that there was any affinity between the Chinese tongue and the Indo-European family of languages, or between these and those of the North-American Indians. CARD. WISEMAN, Lect. ii., *On the Connection between Science and Revealed Religion*, admits 'a radical difference' among languages:—

As the radical difference among the languages forbids their being considered dialects, or offshoots of one another, we are driven to the conclusion that, on the one hand, these languages must have been originally united in one, whence they drew their common elements, essential to them all (?), and on the other, that the separation between them, which destroyed other and no less important elements of resemblance, could not have been caused by any gradual departure or individual development,—for these we have long since excluded,—but by some violent, unusual, and active force, sufficient alone to reconcile these conflicting appearances, and to account at once for the resemblances and the differences.

1287. But the truth is, as an able writer has said, *West. Rev.* Jan. 1865, p. 62, that 'the *Analysis of Language* has taught some strange lessons.'

It tells us that man had lived, perhaps for ages, before the process of metaphor had created a single term to convey an immaterial conception. It has traced the working of metaphor, in its conversion of general notions into personal beings, and in the translation of phrases applied originally to outward phenomena into incidents professedly historical. And, thus teaching us, it has brought us to a point from which we may well turn to survey the ground which we have traversed.

The popular theology of Christendom asserts that man started into being in the full perfection of his mental powers, and with the privilege of an immediate intercourse with his Maker. The *Science of*

Language has shown that man may at the first have been mute, and certainly that he was unable, during a long period, to express more than the merest bodily sensations. Its dispassionate analysis has shown that—

'It was an event in the history of man, when the ideas of father, mother, sister, husband, wife, were first conceived and first uttered. It was a new era, when the numerals from one to ten had been framed, and when words like law, right, duty, virtue, generosity, love, had been added to the dictionary of man. It was a revelation, the greatest of all revelations, when the conception of a Creator, a Ruler, a Father, of man,—when the name of God was for the first time uttered in this world.' Prof. MAX. MÜLLER, *Lectures on Language, second series, p. 308.*

1288. G.xi.4.

'And they said, Come, let us build for us a city, and a tower with its head in heaven.'

The story of the 'dispersion of tongues' is connected by the Jehovistic writer with the famous unfinished Temple of Belus (*Birs Nimroud*), of which, probably, some wonderful reports had reached him, in whatever age we may suppose him to have lived. The language and actions, which are here ascribed to the Divine Being, are strangely anthropomorphic. But the derivation of the name *Babel*, from the Hebrew *balal*, 'confound,' which seems to be the connecting point between this story and the Tower of Babel, is, as we have already noticed (949), altogether incorrect,—the word being compounded probably of 'El' or 'Il,' so that 'Bab-Il' means 'Gate of God.' This is sufficient to show that the story before us is not historically true. It does not, however, necessarily imply, as TUCH and KNOBL assume, that the Jehovist himself originated the story, as he may have received it in this form from others. Prof. RAWLINSON says, *SMITH's Dict. of the Bible*, i. p. 149:—

The name is connected in Genesis with the Hebrew root, *balal*, 'confundere,'—'because the Lord did there confound the language of all the earth.' But the native etymology is *Bab-Il*, 'the gate of the God Il,' or, perhaps, most simply, 'the gate of God.' And this, no doubt, was the original intention of the appellation as given by Nimrod, though the other sense came to be attached to it after the 'Confusion of Tongues.'

1289. The following account of *Birs Nimroud* is from KALISCH, *Gen. p. 315*:

The huge heap, in which bricks, stone, marble, and basalt, are irregularly mixed, covers a surface of 49,000 feet; while the

chief mound is nearly 300 feet high, and from 200 to 400 feet in width, commanding an extensive view over a country of utter desolation. The tower consisted of seven distinct stages or square platforms, built of kiln-burnt bricks, each about twenty feet high, gradually diminishing in diameter. The upper part of the brickwork has a vitrefied appearance; for it is supposed that the Babylonians, in order to render their edifices more durable, submitted them to the heat of the furnace; and large fragments of such vitrefied and calcined materials are also intermixed with the rubbish at the base. This circumstance may have given rise to, or at least countenanced, the legend of the destruction of the Tower by heavenly fire, still extensively adopted among the Arabians. The terraces were devoted to the planets, and were differently coloured, in accordance with the notions of Sabeian astrology,—the lowest, Saturn's, *black*, the second, Jupiter's, *orange*, the third, Mars', *red*, the fourth, the Sun's, *yellow*, the fifth, Venus's, *white*, the sixth, Mercury's, *blue*, the seventh, the Moon's, *green*. Merodach-adan-akhi is stated to have begun it B.C. 1100. It was finished five centuries afterwards by Nebuchadnezzar, who has left a part of its history on two cylinders, which have lately been excavated on the spot, and thus deciphered by RAWLINSON. 'The building, named the Planiisphere, which was the wonder of Babylon, I have made and finished. With bricks enriched with lapis lazuli, I have exalted its head. Behold now the building, named "the Stages of the Seven Spheres," which was the wonder of Borsippa, had been built by a former king. He had completed forty-two cubits of height; but he did not finish the head. From the lapse of time it had become ruined. They had not taken care of the exit of the waters; so the rain and wet had penetrated into the brickwork. The casing of burnt brick lay scattered in heaps. Then Merodach, my great lord, inclined my heart to repair the building. I did not change its site, nor did I destroy its foundation-platform. But, in a fortunate month, and upon an auspicious day, I undertook the building of the raw-brick terraces, and the burnt-brick casing of the Temple. I strengthened its foundation, and I placed a titular record on the part which I had rebuilt. I set my hand to build it up, and to exalt its summit. As it had been in ancient times, so I built up its structure. As it had been in former days, thus I exalted its head.'

1290. If the Jehovist lived in Solomon's days, about B.C.1015-975, and the Temple of Belus was begun, as KALISCH has just said, by Merodach-adan-akhi in B.C.1100, not more than a century would have elapsed to his time, hardly long enough for the unfinished building, however wonderful, to have become the subject of a legend. But, as the *tower* was apparently an observatory, and the fact of its being dedicated to the seven ancient planets

shows that astronomical observations had made considerable progress among the Chaldeans at the time when it was built, the traditions connected with it may have embodied stories of a much earlier date, to which the new building gave fresh currency.

1291. Prof. RAWLINSON, however, says, SMITH'S *Dict.i.p.*159:—

The supposed date [of the building of the Temple of *Mugheir*] is B.C. 2300—a little earlier than the time commonly assigned to the building of the Tower [of Babel]. Probably the erection of the two buildings was not separated by a very long interval, though it is reasonable to suppose that, of the two, the tower was the earlier. If we mark its date, as perhaps we are entitled to do, by the time of Peleg, the son of Eber and father of Ren, we may perhaps place it about B.C. 2600.

But it is evident that the above reasoning is very loose, and based almost entirely on traditional prepossessions. And here the date of the building of the Tower is carried up beyond 2348 B.C., the date which the *Hebrew Scriptures* fix for the Deluge, though it is still below that fixed by the LXX,—on which point see below (1303).

1292. Mr. BEVAN also gives from OPPERT, in SMITH'S *Dict. of the Bible*, iii. p.1554, another version of the inscription, agreeing substantially with the above; but instead of the passage,—

Behold now the building, named 'the Stages of the Seven Spheres,' which was the wonder of Borsippa, had been built by a former king. He had completed forty-two cubits of height: but he did not finish the head. From the lapse of time it had become ruined—

OPPERT translates:—

This edifice, the house of the seven Lights of the Earth, the most ancient monument of Borsippa, a former king built it, (*they reckon forty-two ages*), but he did not complete its head. Since a remote time people had abandoned it, without order expressing their words.

And this is quoted as 'mentioning the Tower in connection with the Confusion of Tongues,'—though OPPERT says,—

This allusion to the 'Tower of the Tongues' is the *only* one that has as yet been discovered in the cuneiform inscriptions.

The reader must judge for himself as to the degree of support afforded to the probability of the historical reality

of the Scripture story by the above translation.

1293. KALISCH describes also the latter fates of the Temple, as follows, *Gen.p.316*:—

The temple of Jupiter Belus with its tower was regarded as one of the most gigantic works of antiquity, and attracted the curiosity of travellers from every country. HERODOTUS, who saw it himself, dwells upon it with emphasis, i.181. . . . It was partially destroyed by Xerxes, when he returned from Greece, B.C. 480; upon which the fraudulent priests appropriated to themselves the lands and enormous revenues attached to it, and seem, from this reason, to have been averse to its restoration. A part of this magnificent edifice still existed more than five centuries later, *PLIN.vi.30*. But the other part was, in the time of Alexander the Great, a vast heap of ruins. The ambitious Macedonian determined to rebuild it, and issued his orders accordingly. But, when the work did not proceed with the vigour and result which he had anticipated, he resolved to undertake it himself with his whole army. He lacked, however, the perseverance of the oriental despots; for, when 10,000 workmen were unable to remove the rubbish within two months, he abandoned his pretensions designs. However, the portion of the structure which was in existence in *PLINY's* time was imposing enough to be still called the Temple of Belus. And Benjamin of Tudela, in the twelfth century, described it as a brick building, the base measuring two miles, and the breadth 240 yards; he adds, that a spiral passage, built round the tower, in stages of ten yards each, led up to the summit, which allows a wide prospect over an almost perfectly level country; and concludes with the old tradition, that the heavenly fire, which struck the tower, split it to its very foundation. More than six hundred years the ruins of *Birs Nimroud* remained unnoticed and unknown. They were first rediscovered by NIEMHUIS, in 1756,—then more accurately described by KER PORTER, RICH. BUCKINGHAM, &c.: but their examination, and the discovery of some of the monumental records they contain, were reserved to the last decennium, 1848-58.

1294. KALISCH also observes, *Gen.p.313*:—

Most of the ancient nations possessed myths concerning impious giants, who attempted to storm heaven, either to share it with the immortal gods, or to expel them from it. In some of these fables the confusion of tongues is represented as the punishment inflicted by the deities for such wickedness. And even JOSEPHUS, *Ant.I.iv.3*, quoted a similar tradition [in the words of the Sibyl, probably of very late date, and copied from the Scriptural story, 'the gods sent storms of wind, and overthrew the tower, and gave every one his peculiar language: and for this reason it was that the city was called Babylon'].

DELITZSCH adds, *p.314*:—

Actually the Mexicans have a legend of a tower-building, as well as of a Flood. Xelhma, one of the seven giants rescued in the flood, built the great pyramid of Cholula, in order to reach heaven, until the gods, angry at his audacity, threw fire upon the building, and broke it down, whereupon every separate family received a language of its own. We will not lay much stress upon it, since the Mexican legend has experienced much colouring at the hands of the narrators,—chiefly Dominicans and Jesuits; and we lay still less upon the point that the Mexican terrace-pyramid has a great resemblance to the construction of the Temple of Belus; but both these points deserve to be noticed.

1295. And upon the credibility of the whole story, as a matter of history, he writes as follows, *p.314*:—

We have, however, other and incomparably more important remains of the event than those uncertain ruins,—[uncertain, only in respect of the question whether the mound, *Birs Nimroud*, does represent the ruins of the Temple of Belus—it is certain that such a Temple, as above described, once existed,—] or these scanty reminiscences. They exist in the languages themselves, standing in more or less remote connection of consequences with that event. Each of these languages is, no doubt, the production and expression of the spiritual and natural constitution of the people, to which it naturally belongs. . . . Certainly, if this wonderful divine influence had not occurred, the one primeval tongue would not have remained in stagnating immobility. It would, by virtue of the rich abundance of the gifts and powers vouchsafed to man, have gone through a process of continual self-enrichment, and have gained in spirit and uniformity. Now, however, when the lingual unity of the race was lost, together with their unity in God, together also with the unity of their all-defining religious consciousness, instead of a manifoldness in unity, there came a splitting-up with loss of unity, a cleaving-asunder with utter loss of connection,—such, however, as points back with a thousand fingers to the fact of the original unity.

If the last statement be true, yet how does it prove the historical truth of the narrative in *G.xi.1-9*?

CHAPTER XII.

GEN.XI.10-XI.26.

1296. THE following Table exhibits the variations from the Heb., of the *Sept.*, *Sam.*, and *Josephus*, in respect of the numbers which express the parent's age at the eldest son's birth, in the list of the Post-Diluvian Patriarchs:—

	Heb.	Sept.	Sam.	Josephus.
Shem (after the Flood)	2	2	2	12
Arphaxad	35	135	135	135
Cainan (not in Heb.)	—	130	—	—
Salah	30	130	130	130
Eber	34	134	134	134
Peleg	30	130	130	130
Ren	32	132	132	130
Serug	30	130	130	132
Nahor	29	79	79	120
Terah	70	70	70	70
Abraham's migration	75	75	75	75
Total from the Flood	367	1,147	1,017	1,068

1297. The Scripture story, then, represents that in Abraham's time, not four centuries after the Deluge, the descendants of Noah's three sons, (who had no children *before* the Flood, xi.10), had so multiplied that there were already in existence the kingdoms of *Shinar* (Babylon), *Elam*, &c., mentioned in G.xiv.1, as engaged in a joint campaign against five kings of Canaan, and those of *Egypt*, G.xiii, and *Gerar*, G.xx. Besides these, however, there were the *Rephaim*, *Zuzim*, *Emim*, *Horim*, who were smitten by the king of Elam, G.xiv.2,5,6, and the multitude of other nations, *Gomer*, *Magog*, *Madai*, &c., who are referred to in G.x as already existing *before* the time of Abraham. This appears from the fact that 'the earth was divided' in the days of Peleg, the *fourth* in descent from Shem, and Abraham was in the *ninth*; whereas all the nations in G.x are described as being in the *first* or *second* from one or other of the sons of Noah, except the Arabian tribes in v.26-29, mentioned as the sons of Joktan, Peleg's brother. Nay, the small district of Canaan was already occupied by many powerful nations, x.15-19.

1298. And some of these nations had already attained a very high state of civilisation.

When Egypt first presents itself to our view she stands forth, not in childhood, but with the maturity of manhood's age, arrayed in the time-worn habiliments of civilisation. Her tombs, her temples, her pyramids, her manners, customs, and arts, all betoken a full-grown nation. The sculptures of the ivth

Dynasty, the earliest extant, show that the arts at that day, some 3,500 B.C. [date of Menes, more than 3,400 B.C. (HUMBOLDT)—3,643 B.C. (BUNSEN)—3,892 B.C. (KENRICK)—3,893 B.C. (LEPSIUS)—3,895 B.C. (HINCKS)—in each case more than 1,000 years before the Usherian date of the Deluge,] had already arrived at a perfection little inferior to that of the xviiith Dynasty, which, until lately, was regarded as her Augustan age. NOTT, *Types of Mankind*, p.211.

Bas-reliefs, beautifully cut, sepulchral architecture, and the engineering of the pyramids,—reed-pens, inks (red and black), papyrus-paper, and chemically-prepared colours,—these are grand evidences of the civilisation of Memphis 5,300 years ago, that every man with eyes to see can now behold in noble folios, published by France, Tuscany, and Prussia. *Ibid.* p.237.

The glimpse which we thus obtain of Egypt, in the fifth century after Menes, according to the lowest computation, [still 1,000 years before the Deluge.] reveals to us some general facts, which lead to import inferences. In all its general characteristics Egypt was the same as we see it a thousand years later, [and for how many centuries before?—a well organised monarchy and religion elaborated throughout the country,—the system of hieroglyphic writing the same, in all its leading peculiarities, as it continued to the end of the monarchy of the Pharaohs. KENRICK'S *Ancient Egypt*, p.131.

1299. Moreover, as before observed, in this short interval the most marked differences of physiognomy must have become stamped on the different races, since we find on the most ancient monuments of Egypt precisely the same negro face, head, hair, form, and colour, fully developed, as we observe in our own days. In three or four centuries—not of the *primeval* time before the Flood, but when that deteriorating change, whatever it may have been, which is intimated in G.vi.3, had already passed upon the race—the complete change of colour, form of skull, and general physical character, had been effected, which seems not to have been modified in the least, from that time to this, during the lapse of four thousand years. Archd. PRATT says, in reference to this, *Scripture and Science*, p.55:—

There is no evidence (!) that Shem, Ham, and Japheth had not in them elements differing as widely as the Asiatic, the African, and the European differ from each other (!). They may have married, too, into different tribes, and their wives have been as diversified as themselves.

1300. DELITZSCH notes on this point, p.290:—

Thus far the *possibility* of the derivation of the peoples from one family is established by Natural Science. Meanwhile, we do not wish to be silent as to the fact, that the maintenance of the contrary is becoming more and more prevalent. The distinguishing characteristics of the races, it is said, lie not only in the colour of the hair, but also especially in the form of the skeleton, and particularly of the skull. This difference is in the case of the principal races so great that it is impossible to account for the variation through any kind of climatic or other ordinary influence. And even if such a variation were possible, yet, in any case, a space of time of about 400 years (from the Flood to the patriarchal times, in which the race-development is already an accomplished fact) is besides far too short; so that both Natural Science and Chronology give positive proof of manifold division of the human race from the very first. As regards the first proof, however, no account is here taken of the incalculably great, and, in correspondence with the character of the primeval time, doubly intensified, influence of the spiritual and moral tendency of that age upon the bodily development. And as regards the second, we await complacently the final results of the investigation of the monuments, especially the Egyptian, and of such inquiries as that about the age of the by-gone American—especially, Mexican—civilisation. Perhaps, the chronological net of the Biblical primeval history really requires an extension. . . .

Allowing, however, that the Scripture has in fact leapt over hundreds, or even thousands, of years, would that be sufficient to throw our thoughts into confusion about it? The Bible history is the history of salvation: the history of salvation is, however, the heart of the world-history. And, as the heart is smaller than the man, although it determines his life, so, perhaps, the Bible chronology is more contracted than the world-chronology, although this is raised upon the scaffold of the other (!). For the sacred history, that of the Gospel, as well as of the Pentateuch, is complex, i.e., it steps from one main-point of the history of salvation to the next, without drawing marked attention to the interval between them.

1301. As DELITZSCH observes, the difficulty lies not so much in the question whether the derivation of all the races of the earth from one family is *possible*. Mr. DARWIN's recent investigations, on the origin of species, have shown us that such derivation is, perhaps, not scientifically inconceivable, *provided only that a sufficient lapse of time be allowed for it*. But then this theory would require *thousands* or *tens of thousands* of years, instead of *four hundred*, which is all the Bible allows us for the development of seventy distinct nations from the three sons of Noah: since, at the time when Abram came into the land of Canaan, we are told—

'the Canaanite and the Perizzite dwelled then in the land,' G. xii. 6, xiii. 7.

1302. Accordingly, Prof. RAWLINSON writes, *Aids to Faith*, p. 282:—

Were we bound down to the numbers of the Hebrew text, in regard to the period between the Flood and Abraham, we should, indeed, find ourselves in a difficulty. Three hundred and seventy years would certainly not seem to be sufficient time for the peopling of the world, to the extent to which it appears to have been peopled in the days of Abraham, and for the formation of powerful and settled monarchies in Babylonia and Egypt. But the adoption of the *Septuagint* numbers for this period, which are on every ground preferable, brings the chronology into harmony at once with the condition of the world, as shown to us in the account given in Scripture of the times of Abraham, and with the results obtainable from the study, in a sober spirit, of profane history. A *thousand* years is ample time for the occupation of Mesopotamia, Syria, and Egypt, by a considerable population, for the formation of governments, the erection even of such buildings as the Pyramids, the advance of the arts generally to the condition found to exist in Egypt under the eighteenth dynasty, and for almost any amount of subdivision and variety in languages.

1303. In another place he writes, p. 259:—

The date of the Deluge, which we are most justified in drawing from the sacred documents, is not, as commonly supposed, B.C. 2348, but rather, B.C. 3099, or even B.C. 3159. The modern objectors to the chronology of Scripture seek commonly to tie down their opponents to the present Hebrew text. But there is no reason why they should submit to this restriction. The LXX version was regarded as of primary authority during the first ages of the Christian Church; it is the version commonly quoted in the N.T.; and thus, when it differs from the Hebrew, it is, at least, entitled to equal attention. The larger chronology of the LXX would, therefore, even if it stood alone, have as good a claim as the shorter one of the Hebrew text, to be considered the chronology of Scripture. It does not, however, stand alone. For the period between the Flood and Abraham the LXX has the support of another ancient and *independent* (?) version, the Samaritan. It is argued that the LXX numbers were enlarged by the Alexandrian Jews, in order to bring the Hebrew chronology into harmony with the Egyptian. But there is no conceivable reason why the Samaritans should have altered their Pentateuch in this direction, and no very ready mode of accounting for the identity of the numbers in these two versions, but by supposing that they are the real numbers of the original.

1304. However, even if we adopt Prof. RAWLINSON's extreme estimate, and suppose the Flood to have occurred B.C. 3099, yet still this is not sufficient (1299) to bring the Scripture

narrative into agreement with scientific fact. And thus we have LEPSIUS writing, *Briefe aus Egypten*, p. 35:—

We are still busy with structures, sculptures, and inscriptions, which are to be classed, by means of the now more accurately determined groups of kings, in an epoch of highly flourishing civilisation, as far back as the *fourth millennium before Christ*. We cannot sufficiently impress upon ourselves and others those hitherto incredible dates. The more criticism is provoked by them, and forced to serious examination, the better for the cause. Conviction will soon follow angry criticism; and finally those results will be attained which are so intimately connected with every branch of antiquarian research.

1305. It is easy, however, to understand why the Alexandrian interpreters *may* have altered the numbers, either for the reason above mentioned by Prof. RAWLINSON (1303), or, perhaps, because they already saw the difficulty which the smaller numbers occasioned. But can any good reason be conceived for the *Hebrews* corrupting *their* Scriptures, and changing the numbers in their Pentateuch, if they had originally the same numbers as are now found in the Septuagint? HALES, indeed, says, *Elements of Hist. Chron.*, i. p. 278:—

The motive, which led the Jews to mutilate the Patriarchal genealogies, is most clearly exposed by *Ephrem Syrus*, who died A.D. 378. 'The Jews,' says he, 'have subtracted 600 years from the generations of Adam, Seth, &c., in order that their own books might not convict them concerning the coming of Christ. He having been predicted to appear for the deliverance of mankind after 5,500 years.'

He quotes also ABULFARAGIUS to the same effect,—the corruption being supposed to have been made after the Christian era, in order to give more time for the appearance of the Messiah, who was expected by tradition to come in the sixth millenary age of the world.

1306. But, as only 4,000 years had elapsed from the Creation to the Christian era, and the Messiah was not expected for 1,500 years, there would seem to have been hardly sufficient reason for the Jews making the alteration in question at so *early* a time,—if ever they desired to make it. Mr. POOLE says, *SMITH's Dict. of the Bible*, i. p. 320:—

With respect to probability of accuracy arising from the state of the text, the Hebrew

certainly has the advantage. There is every reason to think that the Rabbins have been scrupulous in the extreme in making alterations. The LXX, on the other hand, show signs of a carelessness that would almost permit change, and we have the probable interpolation of the second 'Cainan.'—[whose name is inserted between Arphaxad and Salah in the LXX, but is rejected by all commentators as an interpolation into the original text.]

1307. Prof. RAWLINSON adds further, p. 264:—

Whether the chronology of these versions admits of further expansion (!)—whether, since the chronologies of the Hebrew Bible, the *Samaritan Pentateuch*, and the LXX differ, we can depend on any one of them (!),—or whether we must not consider that this portion of Revelation has been lost to us, by the mistakes of copyists, or the intentional alterations of systematisers (!),—it is not necessary at present to determine. 'Our treasure,' as before observed, 'is in earthen vessels.' The revealed Word of God has been continued in the world, in the same way as other written compositions, by the multiplication of copies. No miraculous aid is vouchsafed to the transcribers, who are liable to make mistakes, and may not always have been free from the design of bending Scripture to their own views. *Still, at present, we have no need to suppose that the numbers have in every case (!) suffered.*

1308. It is difficult to see what could have been the object of a miraculous *revelation of numbers*, if there was not to be also a miraculous *preservation* of them. But, as regards the numbers now under consideration, it is plain from the Table given in (1296), that the numbers in the genealogy to the birth of Terah 'have in every case suffered,' and been *designedly* altered, either by the Hebrews *diminishing*, or the LXX *increasing*, each age by a century. There is no indication in these lists of any other than '*intentional* alterations of systematisers.' The question is, who are most likely to have corrupted the original numbers, the Hebrews or the Alexandrians?

1309. Upon the general question of the possibility that all human beings may have been derived from one pair, and that all the now-existing varieties of the race may have been gradually developed during a prodigious lapse of time, through a long succession of ages, the following remarks of Dr. NORR, tending to show that there may have been different centres of creation for the human race, are well worthy of consideration, *Types of Mankind*, p. 273–5.

These authorities, in support of the extreme age of the geological era to which man belongs, though startling to the unscientific, are not simply the opinions of a few; but such conclusions are substantially adopted by the leading geologists everywhere. And, although antiquity so extreme for man's existence on earth may shock some preconceived opinions, it is none the less certain that the rapid accumulation of new facts is fast familiarising the minds of the scientific world to this conviction. The monuments of Egypt have already carried us far beyond all chronologies heretofore adopted; and, when these barriers are once overlapped, it is in vain for us to attempt to approximate, even, to the epoch of man's creation. This conclusion is not based merely on the researches of such archaeologists as LEPsius, BUNSEN, BIRCH, HUMBOLDT, &c., but on those also of such writers as KENRICK, HYNCKS, OSBORN, and we may add, of all theologians, *who have really mastered the monuments of Egypt*. Nor do these monuments reveal to us only a *single* race, at this early epoch, in full tide of civilisation; but they exhibit faithful portraits of the same African and Asiatic races, in all their diversity, which hold intercourse with Egypt at the present day.

Now the question naturally springs up, whether the aborigines of America were not contemporary with the earliest races, known to us, of the eastern continent. If, as is conceded, 'Caucasian,' 'Negro,' 'Mongol,' and other races, existed in the Old World, already distinct, what reason can be assigned to show that the aborigines of America did not also exist, with their present types, 5,000 years ago? The naturalist must infer that the fauna and flora of the two continents were contemporary. All facts, and all analogy, war against the supposition, that America should have been left by the Creator a dreary waste for thousands of years, while the other half of the world was teeming with organised beings. This view is also greatly strengthened by the acknowledged fact, that not a single animal, bird, reptile, fish, or plant, was common to the Old and New Worlds. No naturalist of our day doubts that the animal and vegetable kingdoms of America were created where they are found, and not in Asia.

The races of men alone in America have been made an exception to this general law. But this exception cannot be maintained by any course of scientific reasoning. America, it will be remembered, was not only unknown to the early Romans and Greeks, but to the Egyptians; and, when discovered, less than four centuries ago, it was found to be inhabited, from the Arctic Sea to Cape Horn, and from Ocean to Ocean, by a population displaying peculiar physical traits, unlike any races in the whole world,—speaking languages bearing no resemblance in structure to other languages,—and living everywhere among animals and plants, specifically distinct from those of Europe, Asia, Africa, and Oceania.

Further, in reflecting on the aboriginal races in America, we are at once met by the striking fact, that their physical characters are wholly independent of all climatic or

known physical influences. Notwithstanding their immense geographical distribution, embracing every variety of climate, it is acknowledged by all travellers, that there is among this people a prevailing *type*, around which all the tribes (north, south, east, and west) cluster, though varying within prescribed limits. With trifling exceptions, all American Indians bear to each other some degree of family resemblance, quite as strong, for example, as that seen at the present day among full-blooded Jews; and yet they are distinct from every race of the Old World, in features, language, customs, arts, religions, and propensities. In the language of MOIRON, who studied this people more thoroughly than any other writer, 'All possess, though in various degrees, the long, lank, black, hair,—the heavy brow,—the dull, sleepy, eye,—the full, compressed, lips,—and the salient, but dilated, nose.' These characters, too, are beheld in the most civilised and the most savage tribes, along the rivers and sea-coasts,—in the valleys, and on the mountains,—in the prairies, and in the forests,—in the torrid and in the icebound regions,—amongst those that live on fish, on flesh, or on vegetables.

The only race in the Old World, with which any connection has been reasonably conjectured, is the *Mongol*. But, to say nothing of the marked difference in physical characters, their languages alone should decide against any such alliance. No philologist can be found to deny the fact, that the Chinese are now speaking and writing a language substantially the same as the one they used five thousand years ago,—and that, too, a language distinct from every tongue spoken by the Caucasian races. On the other hand, we have the American races, all speaking dialects indisputably peculiar to this continent, and possessing no marked affinity with any other. Now, if the Mongols have preserved a language entire, in Asia, for 5,000 years, they should likewise have preserved it *here*, or, to say the least, some trace of it. But, not only are the two linguistic groups radically distinct, but no *trace* of a Mongol tongue, dubious words excepted, can be found in the American idioms. If such imaginary Mongolians ever brought their Asiatic speech into this country, it is clear that their supposed descendants, the Indians, have lost it, and the latter *must have acquired, instead, that of some extinct race, which preceded a Mongol colonisation*. It will be conceded that a colony or nation could never lose its vocabulary so completely, unless through conquest and amalgamation,—in which case they would adopt *another* language. But, even when a tongue ceases to be spoken, some trace of it will continue to survive in the names of individuals, of rivers, places, countries, &c. . . . The appellatives, Mississippi, Missouri, Orinoko, Ontario, Oneida, Alabama, and a thousand other Indian names, will live for ages after the last Red Man is mingled with the dust. They have no likeness to any nomenclature in the Old World.

1310. He adds also on p. 281 :

The following conclusions were advanced by Mr. DUPONCEAU, as early as 1819, in substantially the following language:—

(i) The American languages, in general, are rich in words and grammatical forms; and in their complicated construction the greatest order, method, and regularity prevail;

(ii) These complicated forms appear to exist in all these languages from Greenland to Cape Horn;

(iii) These forms differ essentially from those of the ancient and modern languages of the Old Hemisphere. We have no reason to believe that a race would ever lose its language, if kept aloof from foreign influences. It is a fact that in the little island of Great Britain the Welsh and the Erse are still spoken, although for 2,000 years pressed upon by the strongest influences, tending to exterminate a tongue. So with the Basque in France, which can be traced back at least 3,000 years, and is still spoken. Coptic was the speech of Egypt for at least 5,000 years, and still leaves its trace in the languages around. The Chinese has existed equally as long, and is still undisturbed. . . The language of Homer lives in a state of purity, to which, considering the extraordinary duration of its literary existence (2,500 years at least), there is no parallel, perhaps, on the face of the globe.

Although the nations of Europe and Western Asia have been in constant turmoil for thousands of years, and their languages torn to pieces, yet they have been moulded into the great heterogeneous Indo-European mass, everywhere showing affinities among its own fragments, but no resemblance to American languages.

1311. This question, however, of the Plurality of Races, is independent of that of the reliance to be placed on the accounts here given of the Patriarchs after the Flood. And, that these are unhistorical, is sufficiently shown by the following Table, where the numbers express the *years after the Flood* of the respective events.

Born	Died years after the Flood
Noah	350
Shem	502
Arphaxad	404
Salah	470
Eber	531
Peleg	340
Ren	370
Serug	393
Nahor	341
Terah	427
Abraham	467
Isaac	572
Jacob	599

1312. According to the above, Noah, Shem, Arphaxad, &c.—in fact, *all* of Abraham's progenitors—were living during many years of Abraham's life, and Shem, Salah, and Eber, outlived him. Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber,

Serug, Terah, were living at the birth of Isaac; and Shem and Eber lived, the one during fifty, and the other during nearly eighty, years of the life of Jacob. Yet we do not find the slightest intimation that either Abraham, Isaac, or Jacob, paid any kind of reverence or attention to any of their ancestors, more especially to their great ancestor Shem, who had gone through that wonderful event of the Deluge,—(except, indeed, on the strange supposition that Melchizedek was Shem),—or that Abraham ever paid a visit to Noah, who, however, is supposed by some (without the slightest warrant from Scripture) to have colonised the extreme East, China, &c., and so to have gone out of his reach.

1313. Again, it will be found that at the time of Isaac's birth,—when Sarah is represented as 'bearing a son to Abraham in his old age,' G.xxi.2,—when Abraham and Sarah were 'old and well-stricken in age,' G.xvii.17, and Abraham 'laughed, and said in his heart, Shall a child be born to him that is a *hundred* years old?' as if that were an extraordinary and surprising age for a man to beget children,—there were actually living, as above, Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, Serug, Terah, aged 580, 390, 355, 325, 229, 170 years respectively, and Eber lived 139 years longer. Must we suppose that none of these had children at the age of a hundred? But of Shem himself we are told, G.xi.10,11—

Shem was an hundred years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the Deluge; and Shem lived, after his begetting Arphaxad, five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

1314. It is plain, then, that Shem's children were *all* born *after* he was a hundred years old; and Shem himself, and, we may suppose, these children, or some of them, were still living at the birth of Isaac. As to the other patriarchs, we are only told their ages at the birth of the firstborn son in each case, and these ages range from 29 to 35 years, except in the case of Abraham's father, who appears to have begotten Abraham at the age of 70, G.xi.26. This last, however, is not certain; as the text may only mean

that Terah's *three* sons were born before he was 70. In all the other cases it is merely said that they 'begat sons and daughters,' and it may be supposed that none, except Shem, had children at the age of a hundred, or near it. But this would involve the incongruity that Arphaxad, Salah, and Eber had no children born to them, during three-fourths or even four-fifths of their lives, which is out of all proportion to the state of things in the present day, and conflicts with the notion, usually entertained, of a remarkable fecundity in those early times, by which the human race was replenished so soon after the Flood.

1315. It will be observed also that the more ancient progenitors, according to the above list, survived the later ones. Thus Noah died ten years *after* Peleg, and therefore he was living at the time of the 'dispersion of tongues.' So also were Shem, Arphaxad, Salah, Eber, and, perhaps, also all the *other* forefathers of Abraham, *viz.* Reu, Serug, Nahor, Terah, since Peleg died first of them all, and we are not told in what year of his life the dispersion took place. It is impossible to say whether the writer supposed that all these Patriarchs, or any of them, took part in the project of building the tower. We may suppose that Noah and Shem did not: but, as to the others, the Scripture only informs us that Terah and his family were idolaters a hundred years before the death of Shem, Jo. xxiv. 2; see also Judith, v. 6, 7.

1316. The following remarks are quoted from Dr. HALES by KITTO, *Hist. of the Jews*, p. 17:—

Upon this supposition, idolatry must have begun and prevailed, and the patriarchal government have been overthrown by Nimrod and the builders of Babel, during the lifetime of Noah himself, and his three sons. If Shem lived unto the 110th year of Isaac, and the 50th year of Jacob, why was not he included in the covenant of circumcision made with Abraham and his family? Or why is he utterly unnoticed in their history? How could the earth have been so populous in Abraham's days? Or how could the kingdoms of Assyria, Egypt, &c. have been established so soon after the Deluge? This last difficulty was strongly felt by Sir W. RALEIGH, who in his *History of the World* remarks,—In this patriarch's time all the then parts of the world were peopled: all

nations and countries had their kings; Egypt had many magnificent cities, and so had Palestine, and all the neighbouring countries, yea, all that part of the world besides, as far as India, and these not built with sticks, but of burnt stone and with ramparts, which magnificence needed a parent of more antiquity than those other men have supposed.' In another place he forcibly observes, 'If we advisedly consider the state and countenance of the world, such as it was in Abraham's time, yea, before his birth, we shall find it were very ill done, by following opinion without the guide of reason, to pare the times over-deeply between the Flood and Abraham; because, in cutting them too near the quick, the reputation of the whole story might perchance bleed.'

CHAPTER XIII.

SCRIPTURE REFERENCES TO THE CREATION, THE FALL, AND THE DELUGE.

1317. It becomes now an interesting, and, for the supporters of the traditional view, a very important, question to consider what notice has been taken by the later Scripture writers of these early portions of the Pentateuch.

Do the Psalmists and Prophets refer to the story of the *First Man*,—to that of the *Garden*, the *Forbidden Fruit*, the *Serpent*, the *Fall*, and the *Deluge*,—as undoubted facts, the truth of which had been attested by Divine authority? Do they speak of these subjects, or any one of them, as if they were well-known and familiar to their own thoughts, and to the thoughts of all around them? Do they quote them freely, as a modern devout poet or preacher would do,—as any earnest student of the Bible, holding the traditional view, would do,—as if they *believed* in them, as truths divinely revealed and infallibly certain?

1318. The reply is easy to be given. They do nothing of the kind. The story of the first man is scarcely even once referred to at all, and only, *if* at all,—which, as we shall presently see, is exceedingly doubtful,—with a slight passing notice, enough just to show that the story was written (as we suppose it was), and in some measure known to the writer and his readers. None of its details are ever mentioned. As LENGKERKE observes, *Kenaan*, p. xvii:

One single certain trace of the employment of the story of Adam's Fall is entirely wanting in the Hebrew Canon. Adam, Eve, the Serpent, the woman's seduction of her hus-

band, &c., are all images, to which the remaining words of the Israelites never again recur.

At all events, there is not the slightest indication that, in the teaching of the Hebrew Prophets, the account of the Fall was quoted and dwelt upon, as we must certainly believe it would have been,—at least, occasionally,—if they had believed in the Divine authority of the narrative.

And as to Noah, his name is never once mentioned, nor is any reference made to the Deluge by any one of the Psalmists and Prophets, except in the latter part of the book of Isaiah, Is. liv. 9, and in Ez. xiv. 14, 20, by writers undoubtedly living after the Captivity.

1319. KURTZ, however, i. p. 87, endeavours to prove that there is, at least, some reference to the story of the Fall in the later writings of the O.T., though he admits that—

it is indeed remarkable that special references to these events occur so rarely.

But the following are the only instances of this kind which he is able to produce, and they include all which Dr. M'CAUL has produced.

(i) *'The wolf and the lamb shall feed together, and the lion shall eat straw like the bullock, and dust shall be the serpent's meat.'* Is. lxxv. 25.

Ans. These words, instead of referring in any way to the curse pronounced in G. iii. 14, express quite another idea. In the passage of Genesis, it is pronounced, as part of the curse upon the serpent, that it should 'eat dust,' while the venomous creature itself was to retain all its power to sting and injure,—to 'bruise the heel' of man. But the Prophet's language implies that the Serpent then, in the Messianic time, like the wolf and lion, shall be no longer hostile and deadly to other creatures or to man, but shall feed contentedly on 'dust' as they upon straw. The Prophet merely refers to the common notion of those times, that the serpent lived partially, if not wholly, on the substance which it drew from the dust through which it wriggled. See the note of KALISCH quoted in (1065).

(ii) *'They shall lick the dust like a serpent, they shall move out of their holes like creeping things of the earth; they shall be afraid of Jehovah our Elohim, and shall fear because of Thee.'* Mic. vii. 17.

Ans. The cause must have been a desperate one, indeed, which compelled Dr. KURTZ to quote this passage,—which merely describes men wriggling along in terror, like worms, upon the ground, (just as the Zulus used to do, when approaching their dreaded king Chaka, and as people still do, when appearing before an Oriental despot,) as having any reference whatever to the curse pronounced upon the serpent in G. iii. 14.

Dr. M'CAUL, however, says, p. 176:—

We have here not only a reference to G. iii. 14, but a quotation of certain words from D. xxxii. 24. The Hebrew word for 'creeping-things' occurs only here, in Deuteronomy, and in Job xxxii. 6.

Ans. That is to say, because in D. xxxii. 24 we find 'creeping-things of the dust,' and in Mic. vii. 17, 'creeping-things of the earth,' and the two phrases used in totally different connections, therefore Micah has made a 'verbal quotation of certain words' (N.B. one word at the most) from Deuteronomy! The allegation reminds one of the ingenious critic who adduced, as a proof of SHAKESPEARE'S acquaintance with Latin, the verbal agreement between the sentence, '*I prae, sequar*,' to be found in TERENCE, and the corresponding sentence, 'Go before, I'll follow,' to be found in SHAKESPEARE. If there is any copying in the case, which appears to be most improbable, we apprehend that it is the later Deuteronomist, who must have imitated his predecessor Micah.

(iii) *'Thou hidest Thy face, they are troubled; Thou takest away their breath, they die, and return to their dust.'* Ps. civ. 29.

(iv) *'His breath goeth forth; he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish.'* Ps. cxlvi. 4.

'All go unto one place; all are of the dust, and all turn to dust again.' Ecc. iii. 20.

'Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the spirit shall return unto Elohim who gave it.' Ecc. xii. 7.

Ans. There may be a reference in these verses to G. iii. 19. But, surely, the sight or the burial of a corpse might suffice of itself to awaken in any pious mind such reflections as these,—even, as we have seen (1074), in the mind of a heathen. And, in any case, Ps. civ. cxlvi, are two strongly Jehovistic Psalms, and were, perhaps, written long after the Captivity. And the book of Ecclesiastes does not contain the name Jehovah at all; which fact combines with other internal evidence to show that it was not written by Solomon, as is generally supposed, but composed (as most critics agree) in a much later age, long after the Captivity, when the name was disused altogether, it would seem, for superstitious reasons. There is no doubt that the present Pentateuch was in existence and well-known in those days, and therefore might have been referred to by any writer; but it cannot be pronounced with any confidence that there is actually any reference to it in the above passages.

But even these passages speak only of the mortality of man. There is no reference whatever to the Temptation, the Sin, the Fall, as an article of the Hebrew Faith, either here or elsewhere.

1320. KURTZ, however, says:—

Equally clear is the reference, Job xxxi. 33. Hos. vi. 7, to the history of the Fall.

In the first of the above texts, Job xxxi. 33, the E.V. reads:—

'If I covered my transgressions as Adam, by hiding mine iniquity in my bosom.'

In the second, Hos.vi.7, we find:—

'But they, *like men*, have transgressed the covenant.'

With the limitation '*equally clear*' the statement of KURTZ may be admitted; for neither in these passages, nor in the former, is there, as it appears to us, the slightest reference to the Fall, though, in the case of Hos.vi.7, we have Dr. M'CAUL's opinion confirming that of Dr. KURTZ.

1321. The Hebrew is the same in both the expressions above italicised; though our translators have rendered it differently in the two cases. It is clear that in the second instance the word can hardly be translated 'Adam,' since Adam had not transgressed any 'covenant,' unless it be supposed (with some commentators) that he transgressed a 'covenant of works'; and, certainly, in any case, the sudden allusion to him would be very abrupt,—the more so, as the other Prophets do not refer to him freely in this way, nor, indeed, do they ever once mention his name at all under any circumstances. Our translators, therefore, have understood the phrase to mean 'like men,' 'after the manner of men,' as in Ps.lxxxii.7,—

'But ye shall die *like men*, and fall like one of the princes.'

And this is, no doubt, the meaning in the other passage also, as will be seen by the following instances of translation.

1322. Thus in Job xxxi.33 we have these:—

'If I have hidden, *as a man*, my sin,' *Vulg.*;

'If I have concealed, *as men*, my faults,' *Syr.*;

'If, even sinning involuntarily, I concealed my sin,' *Sept.*;

'If I have covered, as Adam, my fault,' *Chald.*;

'If, *as men*, I have concealed my faults,' *French*, (CAHEN);

'If *as a man* I have hid my sin,' *Douay Vers.*

'If, *as a man*, I have covered my roguery,' *German*, (LUTHER);

'If I have hidden my sin, *as men* are wont to do,' *Italian*, (DIODATI);

'If I have covered, *as a man*, my transgressions,' (SCHMIDT);

'If I have covered, *after the fashion of men*, my faults,' (JUNIUS, TREMELLIUS).

'Have I ever done any wicked deed, where-thorow I shamed myself *before men*?' WYCLIFFE.

And in Hos.vi.7 we have:—

'They, however, as Adam, have transgressed the covenant,' *Vulg.*;

'They, however, *as a son of man*, have transgressed my covenant,' *Syr.*;

'They are *as a man* transgressing a covenant,' *Sept.*;

'They are *like a man* breaking there a covenant,' *Arab.*;

'They, as the generations of old, transgressed my covenant,' *Targ. Jon.*;

'They, *as the common people*, have transgressed the covenant,' *French* (CAHEN);

'They, as Adam, transgress the covenant,' *German* (LUTHER);

'They, like men, have transgressed a covenant,' (JUNIUS, TREMELLIUS).

1323. KURTZ further proceeds to say:

The same remark applies to Is.xliii.27, where the expression, 'thy first father hath sinned,' can only refer to Adam, as the best commentators have shown. However, HOFMAN views the latter passage as an allusion to Abraham.

But if we consider the whole verse,—

'Thy first father hath sinned, and thy teachers have transgressed against me,'—

it is clear that the reference cannot possibly be to *Adam*, whoever may be meant by it. What had Adam to do particularly with the people of Israel? The reference is manifestly to the people of Israel itself, when on its march out of Egypt, which is here personified as the 'first father' of the present generation. And, accordingly, the LXX has 'your first fathers,' which LUTHER follows, 'Deine voreltern haben gesündigt,' = Thy ancestors have sinned.

1324. KURTZ adds:—

Let it also be remembered that all the sacrificial services of the O.T. are based on G.iii. (1). Nor can we be mistaken in finding in the expression 'surely die,' which so frequently occurs in the Mosaic criminal legislation, a reference to the 'surely die' of the first legislation in G.ii.17(1).

If any inference could be drawn from the occurrence of such a phrase both in Leviticus and in G.ii.17, it would only be this, that the *same* writer was concerned in both cases.

1325. Finally, KURTZ sums up, as follows:—

If any doubt should still remain, we submit that the facts, recorded in these chapters, *are chronicled with a childlike simplicity*, and that hence the manifold deep bearing of this narrative required a lengthened training, before it could be perfectly apprehended in the consciousness of the individual, [even of such a Prophet as Isaiah or Jeremiah, or of

any one of the Psalmists, after a 'lengthened training' of so many centuries!] So rich and deep is always the *commencement* of a development, that the *continuation* of it is not sufficient fully to bring its treasures to light. It is only at its completion that all which had lain concealed in it appears.

1326. We thus see how very slight, if any, is the reference to this part of the Pentateuch, in the writings of the most devout men of latter days; though we find distinct references to the Fall in the apocryphal book of Wisdom, ii. 24, where also the 'Serpent' is for the first time identified with the Evil Spirit, after the Hebrews had come into close contact with the later Persian mythology:—

'Through the envy of the Devil came death into the world.'

And so we read in Ecclus. xxv. 24:—

'Of the woman came the beginning of sin, and through her we all die.'

1327. TUCH observes, p. 54:—

This later revival [of the ancient myth in G.iii] explains itself through the acquaintance, which, while in exile, the Israelites made with the religion of the Parsees, the influence of which shows itself plainly in this, that the serpent is explained to mean Satan, now incorporated into the Jehovah-worship. . . . Thus the old Hebrew form of the myth is brought nearer to the Persian (1087). The essential difference of the two myths ought to be a sufficient proof *against* the derivation of the Hebrew from the Persian, maintained by Von BOILEN and others, who deduce from this the later [rather, *very* late] origin of G.iii. *For why should not, in that case, Satan appear in action* [i.e. in person, not in the form of a serpent,] *which the later form of the Hebrew religion allowed?* Certainly, however, these myths stand in a sisterly relation, having proceeded from one primary legend, which in different forms has spread itself over the whole Orient.

1328. But in the older Canonical Scriptures we find no such references,—no allusion of any kind to the story of Adam and Eve and the Fall, or to that of Noah and the Deluge, except, as we have said, in Is. liv. 9, Ez. xiv. 14, 20.

Mention, indeed, is made in the Proverbs of the 'tree of life' in four passages:—

- 'She is a *tree of life* to them that lay hold upon her,' iii. 18;
- 'The fruit of the righteous is a *tree of life*,' xi. 30;
- 'When the desire cometh, it is a *tree of life*,' xiii. 12;
- A 'wholesome tongue is a *tree of life*,' xv. 4;—

and of the 'fountain of life' in four others:—

- 'The mouth of the righteous is a *fountain of life*,' x. 11;
- 'The law of the wise is a *fountain of life*,' xiii. 14;
- 'The fear of Jehovah is a *fountain of life*,' xiv. 27;
- 'Understanding is a *fountain of life* unto him that hath it,' xvi. 22:—

and so, too, we read, Ps. xxxvi. 9:—

- 'With Thee is the *fountain of life*.'

But these expressions are evidently proverbial, and drawn at all events from some other source than G.ii,iii, which makes no mention at all of the 'fountain of life.'

1329. It is very difficult to explain this silence on the traditionary view, as it is stated by Dr. M'CAUL, *Examination*, &c., p. 208, viz. that—

there never was a time in Israel, from the days of Moses on, when the Pentateuch was unknown.

It seems, in fact, with only the above evidence before us, impossible to believe, that the devout Prophets, Priests, and Kings, and pious people all along, were thoroughly conversant with the written Law, were deep in the study of it, and practising its precepts daily,—were reminded annually of its existence by the sacred ordinances, which the more religious minds among them faithfully observed, and were also summoned once in seven years to hear the whole Law read at the Feast of Tabernacles, D. xxxi. 9–13.

1330. But it is easy to account for this phenomenon, if we suppose that the story of the Fall was, as we have seen already some reason to believe, written by the Jehovist, not earlier than the latter part of David's reign, and was known to the great and good of that time as only a narrative, written for the edification of the people, by some distinguished man of the age. Probably, one or two copies may have been made of it, or, perhaps, only one, which remained in the charge of the Priests, and may have been added to from time to time. But the existence of this was so little known in after days,—in other words the book, in the form which it had then assumed, was allowed, even by the best Kings,

Priests, and Prophets, to drop so completely into oblivion,—that in the time of Josiah, when the 'Book of the Law' was found in the Temple, the very idea of any such book being *still* in existence seemed quite strange to the king and to his people.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONCLUDING REMARKS.

1331. WE have now completed the analysis and examination of the First Eleven Chapters of Genesis. The analysis has clearly shown that this portion of the Pentateuch, at all events, is not the work of one author,—that the hands of (at least) two distinct writers can be traced throughout in it, one of whom, as far as present appearances indicate, must have written subsequently to the other, and with the older document before him,—though it still remains to be considered whether the later of the two wrote merely to fill up the blanks, which appeared to his mind to exist in the older story, or whether he composed originally a complete separate narrative, which was afterwards, in a later age, incorporated with the older work. It is possible, also, that some of the Jehovistic passages in these chapters may be due to the hand of a later Compiler or Editor. But to anyone, who has followed carefully the train of reasoning by which the above main result has been obtained, it will be evident, as we believe, that it does not rest on mere fancy or conjecture,—that it is an undeniable fact.

1332. If this be true, there is no room for the supposition that these are merely fragments of older documents, handed down from Jacob, Abraham, Noah,—even from Adam,—which have been worked in by Moses himself into the narrative, which he was composing in the wilderness for the instruction of the people of Israel in all future ages. Even were this supposition well-founded, the historical value of this part of the Bible would be seriously weakened, and its (supposed) infallible accuracy impaired, not only

by the contradictions, which, as we have seen, it presents throughout to innumerable facts of Modern Science, but also by the discrepancies which are observed to exist, when separate statements of the different authors, whose writings are here put together, are compared with one another.

1333. But the supposition itself is inadmissible, because the same two hands can be traced distinctly, not only throughout the rest of the Book of Genesis, but also in the later part of the history, where Moses himself in person comes upon the scene. Thus all critics allow that in E.vi.2-7 we have a portion of the Elohist document, written undoubtedly by the selfsame hand which wrote G.i. If, therefore, it be supposed that Moses himself was the writer of E.vi.2-7,—and it would seem that Moses *must* have written it, if he wrote any part of the Pentateuch, since no other but Moses *could* have given an account, from actual *personal* knowledge, of the revelation of the name 'Jehovah' contained in this passage,—it must be admitted that this older document, by the hand of the great Lawgiver himself, has been greatly enlarged and materially modified, by the introduction of a number of important passages by a later hand.

1334. But, whether Moses wrote the Elohist document or not,—a question which we must leave to be discussed in a future Part of this work,—it is plain, from what we have had before us, that not only is the Elohist matter of this part of Genesis at variance in some important points with the Jehovistic, but they both conflict repeatedly, in the strongest manner, with the undoubted facts of Science, and neither, therefore, of the two narratives can be regarded as throughout historically true. For, as already observed, the Light of Revelation cannot be at variance with the Light of Science; the real Word of God cannot either contradict itself, or contradict the real Word of God. It follows from this that we must not look for the real Word of God in these contradictory statements of matters of fact,—in the mere outward shell, the letter, of

the Scriptures. The Word of God, in the high and proper sense of this expression, is *that* in the Bible—the living Word—which speaks to the hearts and consciences of living men,—which stirs within them divine thoughts, kindles devout feelings, impels to faithful action, awakens holy desire, reveals to the longing eye and the pure heart the Living God.

1335. As Prof. OWEN has admirably said, *Inaugural Address at Leeds*, Dec. 16, 1862, p.8:—

Those who contend that such religious truths rest essentially on the basis of the literal and verbal accuracy and acceptability of every physical proposition in the Pentateuch, hazard much, and incur grave responsibilities. . . . When a physical fact is demonstrated, and contradicts a canonical statement, it is sometimes objected that the contradiction is apparent, not real: or, if the propositions are too plainly and diametrically opposed, it is next said that 'the truth, as it is manifested in the works, and as it is affirmed in the Word, of God, must be one, must ultimately harmonise.' But here the very point at issue is assumed, *viz.* whether the ancient statement of a physical fact be truly, as alleged, a direct verbal inspiration from above, a literal Word of God . . . whether, I say, the alleged inspired statements as to these phenomena, in their plain sense, be conformable to the certain knowledge, which it has pleased the Author of all Truth to put us in possession of, by the exercise of the powers He has given for that purpose, and at the times when, in His Providence, it was proper that such truths should be communicated to mankind.

When the canonical statement and the scientific demonstration do concur, who rejoices more than the Christian philosopher? When they do not, and the opposing statements are irreconcilable, who is more bound than the Christian philosopher [or the Christian minister] to deliver the truth and declare the error, and *fling from him the sophism by which the error is salted or veiled, that it may still be reverently cherished, notwithstanding the admitted demonstration of its erroneous nature?*

1336. It is only, however, a careful, critical analysis, such as that which we have attempted to carry out in the larger edition, the presentation of the different portions of the narrative, which are due to different authors, such as we have exhibited above in (968), that can dispel effectually from the minds of many even intelligent persons, well read in science, the lingering remains of that fancy, with which, perhaps, they have been thoroughly imbued in their youth, that the Bible cannot be a Teacher—a Divinely-given

Teacher—for us in spiritual things, unless we regard it as a part of our religious duty to receive, with submissive, unquestioning, faith, all its statements of fact, as indisputable, infallible, words of historical truth, to the accuracy of which the Divine Veracity itself is pledged. So strong, indeed, is the force of habit, that, while the Pentateuch is regarded as wholly or chiefly the work of Moses, men will still cling to the notion,—or the notion will still cling to them,—that it may be possible in some way to reconcile its statements with fact. It is only when the work is resolved into its separate elements that the charm is broken,—the delusion passes off,—and the power ceases to act, which binds men to the mere letter of the Scripture as the revealed Word of God.

1337. And then comes the danger—the result of all this erroneous teaching, which insists upon maintaining that,—‘the very foundations of our faith, the very basis of our hopes, the very nearest and dearest of our consolations, are taken from us, when one line of that Sacred Volume, on which we base everything, is declared to be unfaithful or untrustworthy.’

It is this,—that, when men's eyes are opened to the real facts of the case, in an age like this of great scientific activity, they may lose their reverence for the Scriptures altogether, and cease to regard the Bible with that true, devout, intelligent, affection,—with that deep sense of the blessings, of which in God's Providence it has been the minister to man, and that living faith in the Divine Truths, which it has been the means of maintaining and propagating through the world,—which every religious mind will feel, and which it is the desire and aim of such critical labours as these to develope and foster.

1338. Nay, even in the case of those, who, having been steeped to the lips in Bibliolatry of this kind from their infancy, have gradually worked their way out of it through the greater part of a life, not without help in various degrees from this teacher and that,—even in their case there may come at length a crisis, when the apologies, the explanations, the transcendental meanings, the looking for the clearing-

up of some hitherto dark mysteries, from which light is to fall on all other disputed points,—when all these are seen to be needless, mere cobwebs of men's brains, spun to bridge over a chasm, which does not really exist between the Scriptures and other writings. And when this crisis arrives, it is not surprising that there should often come with it at first a danger of some revulsion of feeling against that which has been treated as an idol, and before which so much anxious thought, so much painful feeling, has been offered as incense. Even before the *crisis*, it is probable that the study of that Book will have been growing less and less general, and the parts most dwelt upon confined to certain more favourite passages.

1339. It will by this time, however, I trust, be apparent to any, who will thoughtfully consider the evidence produced in this work, that, whatever may have been the case in times past, our religious duty now,—our duty to obey the Truth, and to follow the revealed Will of our Creator,—so far from requiring us to receive any longer the stories, which we have been here considering, as true unquestionable facts of history—on the contrary, requires us to *reject* them *as such*. It requires us all,—instead of forcing the Scripture narrative, in these first chapters of Genesis, to yield to us lessons, which it would not naturally teach us, or trying to evade the conclusions, which *may* naturally be drawn from these and other passages,—to be ready to receive, with devout faith and humble adoration, that wondrous Revelation of Himself, which God is manifestly making in these our days, by giving us the glorious Light of Modern Science,—those grand lessons of Eternal Truth, which that Light displays to us.

1340. Why should not our clergy be the first to teach these lessons to their flocks, varying the dry routine of dogmas, or the stereotyped 'improvements' of Scripture texts, to which the discourses of so many of them are now exclusively confined,

by bringing before them freely the ennobling and strengthening, yet, at the same time, sobering, humbling, solemnizing views, which the great scientific discoveries of our own time unfold to us? There are, indeed, many among the clergy, who are themselves distinguished in scientific pursuits, and who are so constituted mentally, that they do not heed the restraints imposed on such studies by dogmatic theology, or do not feel them. It is far otherwise with many others. They *dare* not entertain some of the great questions of the day, or face for themselves, much less for their congregations, some of the most interesting and certain conclusions, at which scientific men have unanimously arrived.*

1341. Brought up in that narrow school of theological training, which ignores altogether the plainest results of Biblical criticism,—taught to regard every word and letter of the Scripture as infallibly true and unspeakably Divine,—they dare not, for their own peace of mind, discuss with any freedom such questions as that of the 'Antiquity of Man,' or the possible existence of different races of mankind, not all derived from one pair of ancestors, but corresponding to different centres of creation, as do the animals among which they are found. They shrink from examining into the historical credibility of the accounts of the Creation, the Fall, and the Deluge, from discussing the Scripture account of the formation of woman, of her temptation, of the entrance of death into the world, of the sentence passed on the dust-eating serpent, the child-

* BRYDONE writes, *Tour through Sicily and Malta*, p.92: 'Recupero has made use of this, as an argument to prove the great antiquity of the eruptions of this mountain (Etna). . . He tells me he is exceedingly embarrassed by these discoveries, in writing the history of the mountain,—that Moses hangs like a dead weight upon him, and blunts all his zeal for inquiry; for that really he had not the conscience to make his mountain so young as that prophet makes the world. . . . The Bishop, who is strenuously orthodox, has already warned him to be on his guard, and not to pretend to be a better natural historian than Moses, nor to presume to urge anything that may in the smallest degree be deemed contradictory to his sacred authority.'

bearing woman, the labouring man,—of the curse passed upon this blessed Earth, blooming now as (Geology tells us) it did of old, when there was no man upon the Earth to till it, no one to see its beauty, and to tell out the Greatness and Goodness of God.

1342. Or, if anyone dares to do this, he is in danger of falling at once under the 'thunders of censure,' threatened by Bishop WILBERFORCE in his recent Charge, or under the weight of his dictum, *Guardian*, Nov. 25, 1863—

'The Church requires of a man a solemn declaration of his belief in that which he is to teach, and that engagement must last so long as he continues to exercise his office. If he ceases to believe,—[e.g. in the literal, historical, truth of the account of Noah's Flood or the numbers of the Exodus,]—he is bound, in common honesty, to resign his office; and, if the dulness of his spirit does not allow him to apprehend that necessity, the Church is bound to remove him.

If the Bishop of OXFORD means the 'belief,' which he speaks of, to include belief in the literal, historical, truth of all Scriptural narratives, he is distinctly at variance with the Court of Arches, which has now expressly declared that *that* is not the law of the Church. Dr. LUSHINGTON said:—

To put a particular construction on a part of Holy Scripture, cannot be deemed a contradiction of the Deacon's declaration of his belief in Holy Scripture. *Judgment in Bishop of SALISBURY v. WILLIAMS.*

As to the right claimed by Mr. WILSON, to deny the reality of any of the facts contained in the Scriptures, it is one thing to deny that the narratives are contained in Holy Scripture, and a very different thing to maintain that such narratives are to be understood in a figurative sense. *Judgment in FENDALL v. WILSON.*

1343. Dean HOOK has said very justly, *Manchester Church Congress*, 1863, that 'the principle of the Reformation (as distinguished from Mediaevalism),' is—the necessity of asserting the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth.

And he added,—

The Mediaevalist did not deny the necessity of maintaining the truth; nor does the Protestant deny that the principle of love is a principle enforced in the Scriptures of the New Testament. But the difference is here,—that the Mediaevalist, in his desire to enlist the affections in the cause of religion, could, when the assertion of the truth was likely to promote discord, postpone the true to the expedient; whereas the Protestant is prepared to sacrifice peace to the maintenance of truth, or what he believes to be such.

1344. We, then, I maintain, as Ministers of the Church,—Ministers, not of a mediæval, but of a Reformed Protestant Church,—are at once both exercising our right, and discharging our duty, in declaring to our people, as opportunity shall offer, 'the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth,' on these matters, so far as we already know it. And, when all Europe is moving on with the advance of the age, we must refuse, as the clergy of a great National Institution, to be held in fetters by the mere word of any man, or to be forbidden to search out thoroughly the truth, in respect of these questions of science and criticism, and to speak out plainly the truth which we find.

1345. For instance, while drawing from these first chapters of Genesis such religious lessons as may be fairly and naturally drawn from them (1021), we may proceed to show how we here possess, by the gracious gift of God's overruling Providence, a precious treasure in these most ancient writings, some parts of which are, beyond all doubt, as we believe, among the *most* ancient now extant in the world. For we have here preserved to us a most deeply interesting and instructive record of those first stirrings of spiritual life among the Hebrew people, which prepared the way for the fuller Revelation, in God's due time, of His Fatherly Love, in the Gospel of JESUS CHRIST,—from which also, by the quickening influences of the Spirit of Grace, has been developed by degrees our modern Christianity,—not without contributions from the gifts bestowed on other portions of the great Human Family, as the same good Spirit has been revealing all along the Name of their Creator to the hearts of men, 'at sundry times and in divers manners,' by different means, in different measures, among the various races of mankind.

1346. And then, too, while tracing in these chapters the first imperfect beginnings among the Hebrew people of cosmological, astronomical, geographical, ethnological science, we may say plainly that the accounts of the Crea-

tion, &c. there given, cannot possibly be regarded as historically true, since the results of Modern Science emphatically contradict them. But we may go on to say also that Science itself is God's precious gift, light coming from the Father of Lights, and specially coming in greater splendour in this very age in which we live, and given to us by His Grace in order that, by means of it, we may see more clearly than before His Glory and His Goodness.

1347. Such teaching as this, which I venture to quote in conclusion from a small book, *First Lessons in Science*, written by me for the use of Zulus and others, though not published, is surely not so very unsound and 'dangerous,' that it needs to be 'inhibited' in all the pulpits of the land:—

(i) 'Standing on the threshold of this Science (Geology), we feel almost overwhelmed, at first, with the awful sense of the enormous lengths of time which have passed, since first the world in which we live was called into being. We obtain from it such an idea of *immeasurable duration*, or what is popularly called *eternity*, as we have never, perhaps, realised before. We look in, as it were, into a dim vaulted chamber, and see arch after arch, reaching away before us, till we can see no farther. We follow, trembling with emotion and dread, through the still, solemn, halls; and when we have a length stepped on into the gloom, far from the light of day and the converse of our kind, we see the interminable range of arched pillars, stretched out as before, age after age, into the infinite Past. Such is the feeling, with which any thoughtful person must read the records of the Earth's past history, written upon the rocks.

(ii) 'And Man has been living for a few thousand years at most upon the Earth. We know this certainly, because, though we find traces innumerable of other living creatures, buried up in the older strata of the Earth's crust, we find none whatever of Man, except in those of comparatively modern date. Surely, then, we cannot say that the Earth was made exclusively for Man. When we think of the ages full of glory and beauty and life, which have passed away before Man was, and of the very small portion of the Earth's surface—still less of the Earth's thin crust—which we can even see and examine, we cannot presume to say that the whole huge Earth was made only for Man. As well might we say that the Sun was made only to give him warmth by day, and the Moon and the Stars to give him light by night.

(iii) 'Yet, if not made *only* for Man, these things have certainly been made, in the Great Creator's scheme, with express and most gracious reference to Man. The Sun, that, hundreds of thousands of years ago, gave

light and heat, under which the forests grew in those primeval swamps, where the coalbeds were formed, must have shone *with some express reference to such a being as Man*, who should be able to make use of such stores as these of hidden treasure, to draw them out of the depths in which they had so long been buried, to turn them to his uses, to extract from them metals and medicines, to obtain from them supplies of light and heat, to contrive the mighty engines, that minister so vastly to the comforts of his daily life, and afford the means of intercourse and communion with his fellows.

(iv) 'Who but a creature like Man could have turned to account the coal, and the lime, and the slate, and the building-stones of various kinds,—the iron, copper, tin, and lead, and a multitude of other substances, mineral and vegetable, which the care of the Creator has provided? How plainly does the simple fact, that these things are, and that Man alone is capable of using them, prove to the reasoning mind that, whatever may be the case *hereafter*, whatever may become of the Earth, whatever creatures may be placed upon it in the ages yet to come, yet Man was *intended* from the first to inhabit this world in his own appointed time, and all the ages that have past, whatever else they have done, have done this also, to fit the Earth to be the home for a time, and the working-place, of Man!

(v) 'Ah, yes! Man's working-place—a place, where we must work out that which accords with the spiritual nature given to us,—a work unto life, or a work unto death. We are sure that, in the sight of Him who is a Spirit, spiritual beings, such as we are, must have a value very different from that of creatures who have merely soul and body, who have merely bodily life and those lower instincts, which distinguish the brute beast from the plant. *They* cannot know the right from the wrong, the good from the evil. We have the Law of God written within our hearts by the finger of our Maker. We have the gracious teachings of His Spirit, the whisperings of His Love, the sense of His Displeasure. We have within us the faint reflections of His glorious excellences. We know His perfect Truth, and Purity, and Goodness, by that very power which He has given us, to take delight in Truth, and Purity, and Goodness,—ay, to love and honour and glorify it in our very heart of hearts, even when we are giving way to some vile temptation, and consent to do what we know to be evil. And there is that within us which tells us, as plainly as the Bible tells us, that 'the wages of sin is death,' that 'he who soweth to the flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption.' And there is something too which tells us that to do the Will of God is life, such life as spirits need and long for,—the life Eternal, which comes from knowing Him more truly, from whom all Light and Life are flowing.

(vi) 'For, even if we had not the Bible to teach us,—wherein we find the utterances of men's hearts in other days, breathed into by the Spirit of God, and answering to that which we feel within ourselves, breathed by the One and selfsame Spirit—yet the contemplation of the works of God could show us an Order, also,

in His universe—a steady, constant sequence of cause and effect—the permanence of fixed laws, from the very first age of the world's existence until now. Those, who first begin to study the formation of the Earth's crust, may be led, as many have been, to imagine, that only by wild, irregular, convulsive efforts, unlike any which we now see in nature, the rocks were made, and the mountains raised, and the valleys sunk. They may fancy that such immense results as these could only have been brought about by a succession of violent earthquakes, by mighty volcanic action, such as might speak, indeed, of Power and Wisdom, of a Will working all things to an end, but would leave upon the mind a painful bewildering sense of disorder, confusion, insecurity.

(vii) 'But True Science teaches us otherwise. It tells us that there is, indeed, a Living Ruler of the Universe, who has made His actual presence felt, and shown forth His Might and Wisdom, in calling into existence, from time to time, whether by some law of development or otherwise, new races of living creatures, differing in size, and form, and character, in wonderful number and variety, to fill up their part in His stupendous whole. But it tells us also that all things are under Law. It tells us that even the volcano and the earthquake, the hurricane and thunderstorm, are all under Law to God, are all governed by laws such as even we can turn to account for a thousand daily uses, when we bind the giant Steam to do our work by land and by sea, and bid the Lightning carry our messages. It teaches us also that far greater results than these, which have been wrought by the hidden action of fire and flood, have been produced by slow, long-continued, action of God's laws, ceaselessly working with unswerving, unflinching certainty.

(viii) 'In one word, it makes us sure that all things are ruled by Law and Order, under the government of God, in the *natural* world; and this tells us that the same also is true in the *moral* world. We are made to feel that, if we break God's Order, or lead others to break it, by acts of sin and fleshly self-indulgence, we shall surely reap the fruit of our doings,—that the results of our actions, whether good or evil, are sure and certain, each answering to its kind, whether completed by some sudden stroke at once, or long delayed, to be brought about after a greater lapse of time, by the same Eternal Laws.

'Some men's sins are open beforehand, leading the way to judgment; and others they follow after. Likewise also the good deeds of some are manifest beforehand; and they which are otherwise cannot be hid.'

(ix) 'This thought makes us feel safe and happy under the government of God. It would be a miserable world to live in, if we could be left alone in sin,—if sin did not surely find us out with judgment,—if we were not sure of this, that things do not go on at random, by caprice and arbitrary choice, under God's government, but by fixed, unerring, immutable Laws, the Laws of Righteousness and Truth, administered, not by mere Sovereign Authority, but by Fatherly Love.

(x) 'And the worlds around us—are these inhabited? We know not yet; nor, perhaps, will it ever be given to man to know this certainly in this life. And one wise man of our own days has taught us to remember this, that we do not know,—that, as far as we do know, the Moon and other Planets are probably not inhabited,—that the Moon, at all events, presents no conditions of life, analogous to those needed for animal and vegetable life on Earth,—that this Earth, therefore, *may* be the only body of our system, *may* be the only body of the Universe, wherein is placed a creature gifted with reason and conscience, such as Man. We dare not say that this is so; nor is it easy to suppose that all the hosts of Stars were made to give us light by night, when a single Moon would give more light than all the Stars, or only to gladden our eyes with their glory and beauty, when few can ever see the visible multitudes of the Starry Heavens, or know the awful wonders which they even now reveal to us, while none can count the number of Suns which make up the star-dust of a single nebula.

(xi) 'But this we know, that for millions of years the Earth was formed, before Man was placed upon it. Hosts upon hosts of living creatures were brought into being, and died, and passed away; their very kinds appear no more on Earth. But there was no human eye to note their forms, or take account of their doings. The forest-tree tossed its branches; the meadow-flowers bloomed; bright colours beamed on every side. The Lord God 'gave rain from heaven and fruitful seasons' for the multitudes of living things who then looked up to Him for food and blessing, as they do now. Sweet scents were spread abroad on every side; sweet sounds were heard. And God was there, to see the works which He had made, and 'behold! they were very good.'

(xii) 'Yet one living soul—one child of Man, made in God's image—is worth more in the eyes of a Spiritual Being, than all the Suns, however grand and glorious,—than all mere systems of unreasoning, unconscious matter. Our happy privilege as Christians is to know and believe this—to be able to look up and say 'our Father,' to Him who made this mighty whole, taking with us the words, which CHRIST Himself has taught us, and believing that He, who has given us the powers which we have, for seeing and feeling the Greatness and Goodness of His works, has *meant* us thus to use them, and will bless us of a truth, while we devoutly 'ponder these things,' and seek to 'understand the loving-kindness of the Lord.' Meanwhile, from each inmost recess of the great Temple of the Universe, into which, while here on Earth, we are permitted to gaze, we may hear, if our hearts are pure and humble, the same solemn utterance:—

'STAND IN AWE AND SIN NOT;
'COMMUNE WITH YOUR OWN HEART, AND
IN YOUR CHAMBER, AND BE STILL.
'OFFER THE SACRIFICES OF RIGHTEOUSNESS,
'AND PUT YOUR TRUST IN THE LORD.'

APPENDIX.

THE COMPLETE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE IN GENESIS.

WE shall so far anticipate the results of the next Part of this Work as to give here in a complete form the whole of the Elohist portion of the Book of Genesis. The reader will thus be able to see what was the extent of the simple primitive story, to which the Jehovistic writer in a later age has added so many remarkable, and often disturbing and contradictory, episodes. Many important consequences may, of course, and must be deduced from this distinct separation of the sources in Genesis, the consideration of which must be reserved for the present, until we have set forth fully the critical reasons upon which this separation is based. I will here only observe that my own conclusions, as to the parts of Genesis which belong to the Elohist document, do not differ materially from those which have been announced by the distinguished German scholar, Professor HUPFELD of Halle, by Professor KUENEN of Leyden, and still more recently by BOEHMER, after a most careful, independent, investigation.

N.B.—The sign * denotes that an interpolated passage has been removed.

THE ELOHISTIC NARRATIVE.

1. (1) In the beginning ELOHIM created the Heaven and the Earth. (2) And the Earth was desolation and emptiness, and darkness *was* upon the face of the deep, and the spirit of ELOHIM hovering upon the face of the waters.

(3) And ELOHIM said, 'Let there be light,' and there was light. (4) And ELOHIM saw the light that *it was* good; and ELOHIM divided between the light and (between) the darkness. (5) And ELOHIM called (to) the light 'Day,' and (to) the darkness He called 'Night.' And it was evening, and it was morning,—one day.

(6) And ELOHIM said, 'Let there be an expanse in the midst of the waters, and let it be dividing between waters (to) and waters.'

(7) And ELOHIM made the expanse, and divided between the waters which *were* beneath the expanse (between) and the waters which *were* above the expanse; and it was so. (8) And ELOHIM called (to) the expanse 'Heaven.' And it was evening, and it was morning,—a second day.

(9) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the waters beneath the Heaven be gathered into one place, and let the dry-land appear'; and it was so. (10) And ELOHIM called (to) the dry-land 'Earth,' and (to) the gathering of waters called He 'Seas'; and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good.

(11) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the Earth vegetate vegetation, the herb seeding seed, the fruit-tree making fruit, after its kind, whose seed is in it, upon the Earth'; and it was so. (12) And the Earth brought forth vegetation, the herb seeding seed after its kind, and the tree making fruit, whose seed is in it, after its

kind; and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good. (13) And it was evening, and it was morning,—a third day.

(14) And ELOHIM said, 'Let there be luminaries in the expanse of the Heaven, to divide between the day and (between) the night, and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days and years; (15) and let them be for luminaries in the expanse of the Heaven, to give light upon the Earth': and it was so. (16) And ELOHIM made the two great luminaries,—the greater luminary for the rule of the day, and the lesser luminary for the rule of the night,—and the stars. (17) And ELOHIM (gave) placed them in the expanse of the Heaven, to give light upon the Earth, (18) and to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide between the light and (between) the darkness: and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good. (19) And it was evening, and it was morning,—a fourth day.

(20) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the waters swarm with swarming-things of living soul, and let fowl fly over the Earth upon the face of the expanse of the Heaven.' (21) And ELOHIM created the great monsters, and every living soul that creepeth, which the waters swarmed after their kind, and every fowl of wing after its kind: and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good. (22) And ELOHIM blessed them, saying, 'Fructify and multiply, and fill the waters in the Seas, and let the fowl abound in the Earth.' (23) And it was evening, and it was morning,—a fifth day.

(24) And ELOHIM said, 'Let the Earth bring forth living soul after its kind, cattle, and creeping-thing, and animal of the Earth after its kind'; and it was so. (25) And ELOHIM made the animal of the Earth after its kind, and the cattle after its kind; and every creeping-thing of the ground after its kind: and ELOHIM saw that *it was* good.

(²⁶) And ELOHIM said, 'Let us make man, in our image, after our likeness; and let them (tread) have-dominion over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the Heaven, and over the cattle, and over every animal of the Earth, and over every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the Earth.' (²⁷) And ELOHIM created man in His image; in the image of ELOHIM created He him; male and female created He them. (²⁸) And ELOHIM blessed them, and ELOHIM said to them, 'Fructify, and multiply, and fill the Earth, and subdue it; and (tread) have-dominion over the fish of the Sea, and over the fowl of the Heaven, and over every animal that creepeth upon the Earth.' (²⁹) And ELOHIM said, 'Behold! I give to you every herb seedling seed, which *is* on the face of all the Earth, and every tree in which *is* the fruit of a tree seedling seed; to you it shall be for food: (³⁰) and to every animal of the Earth, and to every fowl of the Heaven, and to everything creeping upon the Earth, in which *is* a living soul, I give every green herb for food'; and it was so. (³¹) And ELOHIM saw all that He had made, and behold! *it was* very good. And it was evening, and it was morning,—the sixth day.

2. (¹) And the Heaven and the Earth were finished, and all their host. (²) And ELOHIM finished on the seventh day His work which He had made, and rested on the seventh day from all His work which He had made. (³) And ELOHIM blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it; for on it He rested from all His work, which ELOHIM created (to make) and made.*

5. (¹) This is the book of the generations of Adam, in the day of ELOHIM's creating Adam; in the likeness of ELOHIM made He him. (²) Male and female He created them, and blessed them, and called their name Adam in the day of their creation.

(³) And Adam lived a hundred and thirty years, and begat, in his likeness, according to his image; and he called his name Seth. (⁴) And the days of Adam, after his begetting Seth, were eight hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. (⁵) And all the days of Adam which he lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and he died.

(⁶) And Seth lived an hundred and five years, and begat Enos. (⁷) And Seth lived, after his begetting Enos, eight hundred and seven years, and he begat sons and daughters. (⁸) And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years, and he died.

(⁹) And Enos lived ninety years, and begat Kenan. (¹⁰) And Enos lived, after his begetting Kenan, eight hundred and fifteen years, and he begat sons and daughters. (¹¹) And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years, and he died.

(¹²) And Kenan lived seventy years, and begat Mahalaleel. (¹³) And Kenan lived, after his begetting Mahalaleel, eight hundred and forty years, and he begat sons and daughters. (¹⁴) And all the days of Kenan were nine hundred and ten years, and he died.

(¹⁵) And Mahalaleel lived sixty-and-five years, and begat Jared. (¹⁶) And Mahalaleel lived, after his begetting Jared, eight hundred and thirty years, and he begat sons and daughters. (¹⁷) And all the days of Mahala-

leel were eight hundred and ninety-five years, and he died.

(¹⁸) And Jared lived an hundred and sixty-two years, and begat Enoch. (¹⁹) And Jared lived, after his begetting Enoch, eight hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. (²⁰) And all the days of Jared were nine hundred and sixty-two years, and he died.

(²¹) And Enoch lived sixty-and-five years, and begat Methuselah. (²²) And Enoch walked with ELOHIM*, after his begetting Methuselah, three hundred years, and he begat sons and daughters. (²³) And all the days of Enoch were three hundred and sixty-five years. (²⁴) And Enoch walked with ELOHIM, and he was not, for ELOHIM took him.

(²⁵) And Methuselah lived an hundred and eighty-seven years, and begat Lamech. (²⁶) And Methuselah lived, after his begetting Lamech, seven hundred and eighty-two years, and he begat sons and daughters. (²⁷) And all the days of Methuselah were nine hundred and sixty-nine years, and he died.

(²⁸) And Lamech lived an hundred and eighty-two years, and begat [Noah].* (²⁹) And Lamech lived, after his begetting Noah, five hundred and ninety-five years, and he begat sons and daughters. (³⁰) And all the days of Lamech were seven hundred and seventy-seven years, and he died.

(³¹) And Noah was a son of five hundred years, and Noah begat Shem, Ham, and Japheth.*

6. (¹) These are the generations of Noah.

Noah was a man just and perfect in his generations: Noah walked with ELOHIM. (²) And Noah begat three sons, Shem, Ham, and Japheth. (³) And the earth was corrupted before the face of ELOHIM, and the earth was filled with violence. (⁴) And ELOHIM saw the earth, and behold! it was corrupted; for all flesh had corrupted its way upon the earth.

(⁵) And ELOHIM said to Noah, 'The end of all flesh has come before my face; for the earth is full of violence from before them; and behold! I will (corrupt) destroy them with the earth. (⁶) Make to thee an Ark of cypress-wood; *in* cells shalt thou make the Ark, and shalt pitch it within and without with pitch.*' (⁷) And I, behold! (*am* bringing) will bring the Flood of waters upon the earth, to (corrupt) destroy all flesh in which is a spirit of life from under the heaven; and all which *is* in the earth shall die. (⁸) But I establish my covenant with thee; and thou shalt go into the Ark, thou, and thy sons, and thy wife, and thy sons' wives with thee. (⁹) And out of every living thing out of all flesh, two out of all shalt thou bring into the Ark, to keep-alive with thee; male and female shall they be. (¹⁰) Out of the fowl after its kind, and out of the cattle after its kind, out of every creeping-thing of the ground after its kind, two out of all shall come unto thee, to keep-alive. (¹¹) And thou, take to thee out of all food which is eaten, and thou shalt gather *it* unto thee, and it shall be to thee and to them for food.'

* We shall print the name thus, in large capitals, whenever it occurs in the original with the article.

(⁶) And Noah did according to all which ELOHIM commanded him,—so did he.*

7. (⁶) And Noah was a son of six hundred years, when the Flood of waters was upon the earth. (⁷) And Noah went, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him, into the Ark, from the face of the waters of the Flood. (⁸) Out of the clean cattle and out of the cattle which are not clean, and out of the fowl and all that creepeth upon the ground, (⁹) two and two, they came unto Noah into the Ark, male and female, as ELOHIM commanded Noah.*

(¹⁰) In the six-hundredth year of Noah's life, in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, on this day were broken up all the fountains of the great deep, and the windows of the heaven were opened.* (¹¹) On this very same day, (*lit.* in the bone of this day,) went Noah, and Shem, and Ham, and Japheth, Noah's sons, and Noah's wife, and his sons' three wives with them, into the Ark; (¹²) they, and every animal after its kind, and all the cattle after its kind, and every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth after its kind, and all the fowl after its kind, every bird of every wing. (¹³) And they came unto Noah into the Ark, two and two, out of all flesh, in which is a spirit of life. (¹⁴) And those coming, male and female out of all flesh they came, as ELOHIM commanded him.*

(¹⁵) And the waters were mighty, and multiplied (very) greatly upon the earth,* (¹⁶) and all the high mountains that were under all the heaven, were covered. (¹⁷) And all flesh died, that creepeth upon the earth, among fowl, and among cattle, and among (animal) animals, and among all the swarming-things that swarm upon the earth, and all man. (¹⁸) All in whose nostrils was the breath of a spirit of life, out of all which was in the dry land, died.* (¹⁹) And only Noah was left, and what *was* with him in the Ark.

(²⁰) And the waters were mighty upon the earth a hundred and fifty days.*

8. (¹) And ELOHIM remembered Noah, and every animal, and all the cattle, that was with him in the Ark; and ELOHIM caused-to-pass a wind upon the earth, and the waters subsided. (²) And the fountains of the deep were stopped and the windows of the heaven;* (³) and the waters decreased at the end of a hundred and fifty days,* (⁴) in the seventh month, in the seventeenth day of the month.* (⁵) And the waters were decreasing continually until the tenth month: in the tenth month, in the first of the month, the tops of the mountains were seen.*

(⁶) And it came-to-pass in the six hundred and first year, in the first month, in the first of the month, the waters were dried up from off the earth: * (⁷) and in the second month, in the seventeenth day of the month, the earth was dry.

(⁸) And ELOHIM spake unto Noah, saying, (⁹) 'Go out from the ark, thou, and thy wife, and thy sons, and thy sons' wives with thee. (¹⁰) Every animal that *is* with thee out of all flesh, among fowl, and among cattle, and among every creeping-thing that creepeth upon the earth, bring forth with thee; and

let them swarm in the earth, and fructify, and multiply, upon the earth.' (¹¹) And Noah went out, and his sons, and his wife, and his sons' wives with him. (¹²) Every animal, every creeping-thing, and every fowl, everything creeping upon the earth,—after their families, they went out from the Ark.*

9. (¹) And ELOHIM blessed Noah and his sons, and said to them, 'Fructify, and multiply, and fill the earth. (²) And the fear of you and the terror of you shall be upon every animal of the earth, and upon every fowl of the heaven, among all that creepeth the ground, and among all the fishes of the sea; into your hand they are given. (³) Every creeping-thing that liveth, to you it shall be for food: as the green herb, I give to you all. (⁴) Only flesh (in) with its soul, its blood, ye shall not eat. (⁵) And surely your blood of your souls will I require: from the hand of every animal will I require it, and from the hand of man; from the hand of a man's brother will I require the soul of man. (⁶) Whoso sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed: for in the image of ELOHIM made He man. (⁷) And you, fructify and multiply, swarm in the earth, and multiply in it.'

(⁸) And ELOHIM said unto Noah, and unto his sons with him, saying: (⁹) 'And I, behold! I (*am* establishing) will establish my covenant with you, and with your seed after you, (¹⁰) and with every living soul which is with you, among fowl, and among cattle, and among (every animal) all animals of the earth with you, from all going out of the Ark to every animal of the earth. (¹¹) And I establish my covenant with you, and all flesh shall not be again cut off through the waters of the Flood, and there shall not be again a Flood to (corrupt) destroy the earth.'

(¹²) And ELOHIM said, 'This is the sign of the covenant which I (*am* giving) will make between me and (between) you, and (between) every living soul that *is* with you for perpetual generations. (¹³) My bow do I (give) set in the cloud, and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between me and (between) the earth. (¹⁴) And it shall be, at my (clouding) bringing a cloud upon the earth, that the bow shall be seen in the cloud. (¹⁵) And I will remember my covenant which is between me and (between) you and (between) every living soul among all flesh; and there shall not be again the waters for a Flood to (corrupt) destroy all flesh. (¹⁶) And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will see it, for a remembrance of the perpetual covenant between ELOHIM and (between) every living soul among all flesh that is upon the earth.'

(¹⁷) And ELOHIM said unto Noah, 'This is the sign of the covenant, which I establish between me and (between) all flesh that is upon the earth.*'

(¹⁸) And Noah lived after the Flood three hundred and fifty years. (¹⁹) And all the days of Noah were nine hundred and fifty years, and he died.*

11. (¹) These are the generations of Shem. Shem *was* a son of a hundred years, and begat Arphaxad two years after the Flood. (²) And Shem lived, after his begetting Arphaxad, five hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

(¹²) And Arphaxad lived five-and-thirty years, and begat Salah. (¹³) And Arphaxad lived, after his begetting Salah, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

(¹⁴) And Salah lived thirty years, and begat (Heber) Eber. (¹⁵) And Salah lived, after his begetting Eber, four hundred and three years, and begat sons and daughters.

(¹⁶) And Eber lived four-and-thirty years, and begat Peleg. (¹⁷) And Eber lived, after his begetting Peleg, four hundred and thirty years, and begat sons and daughters.

(¹⁸) And Peleg lived thirty years, and begat Reu. (¹⁹) And Peleg lived, after his begetting Reu, two hundred and nine years, and begat sons and daughters.

(²⁰) And Reu lived two-and-thirty years, and begat Serug. (²¹) And Reu lived, after his begetting Serug, two hundred and seven years, and begat sons and daughters.

(²²) And Serug lived thirty years, and begat Nahor. (²³) And Serug lived, after his begetting Nahor, two hundred years, and begat sons and daughters.

(²⁴) And Nahor lived nine-and-twenty years, and begat Terah. (²⁵) And Nahor lived, after his begetting Terah, a hundred and nineteen years, and begat sons and daughters.

(²⁶) And Terah lived seventy years, and begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran.

(²⁷) And these are the generations of Terah.

Terah begat Abram, Nahor, and Haran; and Haran begat Lot.* (²⁸) And Terah took Abram his son, and Lot, the son of Haran, his son's son, and Sarai his daughter-in-law, the wife of Abram his son, and they went out with them together from Ur of the Chaldees to go to the land of Canaan; and they went as far as Charran, and dwelt there. (²⁹) And the days of Terah were two hundred and five years, and Terah died in Charran.*

12. (³⁰) And Abram was a son of seventy-five years at his going out from Charran. (³¹) And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother's son, and all their gain which they had gotten, and the souls which they had made in Charran, and they went out to go to the land of Canaan, and they came to the land of Canaan.* 13. (³²) And the land did not bear them to dwell together, for their gain was much, and they were not able to dwell together.* (³³) Abram dwelt in the land of Canaan, and Lot dwelt in the cities of the circuit.*

16. (³⁴) And Sarai, Abram's wife, bare not to him, and she had a maid, an Egyptian, and her name was Hagar.* (³⁵) And Sarai, Abram's wife, took Hagar the Egyptian, her maid, at the end of ten years of Abram's dwelling in the land of Canaan, and gave her to Abram her husband to him for wife.* (³⁶) And Hagar bare to Abram a son, and Abram called the name of his son, which Hagar bare, Ishmael. (³⁷) And Abram was a son of eighty-and-six years at Hagar's bearing Ishmael to Abram.*

17. (³⁸) And Abram was a son of ninety-and-nine years, and [*] appeared unto Abram and said unto him, 'I am EL-SHAADDAI: walk before me, and be perfect. (³⁹) And I will (give) make my covenant between me and thee, and I will very greatly multiply thee.'

(⁴⁰) And Abram fell upon his face, and ELOHIM spake with him, saying, (⁴¹) 'I—behold! my covenant is with thee, and thou shalt be a father of a multitude of nations. (⁴²) And thy name shall not be called any longer Abram, but thy name shall be Abraham; for I (give) set thee a father of a multitude (*ab-hāmon*) of nations. (⁴³) And I will very greatly fructify thee, and will (give) set thee for nations; and kings shall go-forth out of thee. (⁴⁴) And I will establish my covenant between me, and thee, and thy seed after thee in their generations for a perpetual covenant, to be to thee ELOHIM, and to thy seed after thee. (⁴⁵) And I will give to thee and to thy seed after thee the land of thy sojournings, the whole land of Canaan, for a perpetual possession, and I will be to them ELOHIM.'

(⁴⁶) And ELOHIM said unto Abram, 'And thou—my covenant thou shalt keep, thou and thy seed after thee in their generations. (⁴⁷) This is my covenant, which they shall keep between me and you and thy seed after thee,—to be circumcised among you every male. (⁴⁸) And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, and it shall be for a sign of a covenant between me and you. (⁴⁹) And a son of nine days shall be circumcised among you, every male in your generations,—child of the house, and purchase of silver from any son of a stranger, which is not out of thy seed. (⁵⁰) Circumcised shall he surely be, child of thy house and purchase of thy silver; and my covenant shall be in your flesh for a perpetual covenant. (⁵¹) And an uncircumcised male, whose flesh of his foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people; he hath broken my covenant.'

(⁵²) And ELOHIM said unto Abraham, 'Sarai thy wife—thou shalt not call her name Sarai, for Sarah is her name. (⁵³) And I will bless her, and also I will give to thee out of her a son, and I will bless her, and she shall be for nations; kings of peoples shall be out of her.'

(⁵⁴) And Abraham fell upon his face and laughed, and said in his heart, 'To a son of a hundred years shall there be born, and shall Sarah, a daughter of ninety years, bear?' (⁵⁵) And Abraham said unto ELOHIM, 'Would that Ishmael may live before thee!' (⁵⁶) And ELOHIM said, 'Truly Sarah thy wife shall bear to thee a son, and thou shalt call his name Isaac (= *he laughs*); and I will establish my covenant with him for a perpetual covenant to his seed after him. (⁵⁷) And as for Ishmael (= *El hears*), I have heard thee. Behold! I have blessed him, and I have fructified him,

* This is the only instance where, in the present Hebrew copies of the Bible, 'Jehovah' occurs in the whole Elohist narrative. The proper formula of the Elohist is seen in xxxv.9, 'And ELOHIM appeared unto Jacob,' identical with that before us, except in respect of the Divine Name. Since, therefore, 'ELOHIM' is found everywhere else (*ten times*) in this very chapter, it seems very probable that it stood originally in v.1, and has been accidentally changed to 'Jehovah,'—perhaps by an oversight of a transcriber. In fact, the *Elohim* of v.3 evidently presupposes *Elohim* also in v.1.

and multiplied him, very greatly: twelve princes shall he beget, and I have (given) appointed him for a great nation. ⁽²¹⁾ And my covenant will I establish with Isaac, whom Sarah shall bear to thee at this season in the following year.' ⁽²²⁾ And ELOHIM finished to speak with him, and ELOHIM went-up from Abraham.

⁽²³⁾ And Abraham took Ishmael his son, and all the children of his house, and all the purchase of his silver, every male among the men of Abraham's house; and he circumcised the flesh of their foreskin on the very same day (*lit.* in the bone of that day), according as ELOHIM spake with him. ⁽²⁴⁾ And Abraham *was* a son of ninety-and-nine years at his being circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. ⁽²⁵⁾ And Ishmael his son *was* a son of thirteen years at his being circumcised in the flesh of his foreskin. ⁽²⁶⁾ On that very same day (*lit.* in the bone of that day) *was* Abraham circumcised, and Ishmael his son. ⁽²⁷⁾ And all the men of his house, child of the house, and purchase of silver, or from a son of a stranger, were circumcised with him.*

19. ⁽²⁸⁾ And it came to pass, as ELOHIM's destroying the cities of the circuit, then ELOHIM remembered Abraham; and He put forth Lot from the midst of the overthrow, at his overthrowing the cities in which Lot dwelt.*

21. ⁽¹⁾ And Sarah conceived and bare to Abraham a son to his old-age, according to the season which ELOHIM had spoken of with him. ⁽²⁾ And Abraham called the name of his son that was born to him, whom Sarah bare to him, Isaac. ⁽³⁾ And Abraham circumcised Isaac his son, a son of eight days, as ELOHIM had commanded him. ⁽⁴⁾ And Abraham *was* a son of a hundred years at Isaac his son's being born to him.*

23. ⁽¹⁾ And the life of Sarah was a hundred and twenty and seven years,—the years of the life of Sarah. ⁽²⁾ And Sarah died in Kirjath Arba in the land of Canaan; and Abraham came to mourn over Sarah and to weep her. ⁽³⁾ And Abraham came from before his dead, and spake unto the sons of Heth, saying, ⁽⁴⁾ 'A sojourner and a dweller *am* I with you: give to me a possession of a burial-place with you, and I will bury my dead from before me.' ⁽⁵⁾ And the sons of Heth answered Abraham, saying, ⁽⁶⁾ ' (Would that) Pray hear us, my lord! A prince of ELOHIM *art* thou in the midst of us: in the choice of our burial-places bury thy dead; no man of us will hold-back his burying-place from thee, from burying thy dead.'

⁽⁷⁾ And Abraham arose, and bowed-himself before the people of the land, to the sons of Heth. ⁽⁸⁾ And he spake with them, saying, ' If it is your (soul) will for me to bury my dead from before me, hear me, and (reach) entreat for me to Ephron, the son of Zohar; ⁽⁹⁾ and he shall give to me the cave of Machpelah, which is his, which is in the end of his field: for full silver shall he give it to me in the midst of you for a possession of a burial-place.' ⁽¹⁰⁾ And Ephron *was* dwelling in the midst of the sons of Heth. And Ephron the Hittite answered Abraham in the ears of the sons of Heth, before all entering at the gate of his city, saying, ⁽¹¹⁾ ' No, my lord! hear

me: the field I give to thee, and the cave which is in it, to thee I give it: before the eyes of the sons of my people I give it to thee: bury thy dead.'

⁽¹²⁾ And Abraham bowed-himself before the people of the land. ⁽¹³⁾ And he spake to Ephron in the ears of the people of the land, saying, ' Only if thou *art* for giving it (would that) pray hear me: I give the silver of the field: take it from me; and I will bury my dead there.' ⁽¹⁴⁾ And Ephron answered Abraham, saying, ⁽¹⁵⁾ ' (Would that) Pray, my lord, hear me: the land is four hundred shekels of silver: between me and thee what is that? so bury thy dead.'

⁽¹⁶⁾ And Abraham hearkened unto Ephron; and Abraham weighed to Ephron the silver which he spake in the ears of the sons of Heth, four hundred shekels of silver, current with the trader. ⁽¹⁷⁾ And the field of Ephron, which *was* in Machpelah, which *was* before Mamre, the field, and the cave which *was* in it, and all the trees which *were* in the field, which *were* in all its border round-about, (arose) stood ⁽¹⁸⁾ to Abraham for a purchase before the eyes of the sons of Heth, among all entering at the gate of his city.

⁽¹⁹⁾ And afterwards Abraham buried Sarah his wife in the cave of the field of Machpelah, eastward of Mamre* in the land of Canaan.

⁽²⁰⁾ And the field, and the cave which *was* in it, (arose) stood to Abraham for a possession of a burying-place from the sons of Heth.*

25. ⁽¹⁾ And these *are* the days of the years of the life of Abraham, which he lived, a hundred and seventy and five years. ⁽²⁾ And Abraham expired, and died in good gray-hairs, old and full of years, and was gathered unto his people. ⁽³⁾ And Isaac and Ishmael, his sons, buried him in the cave of Machpelah, in the field of Ephron, the son of Zohar the Hittite, which *was* eastward of Mamre,—⁽⁴⁾ the field which Abraham bought from the sons of Heth: there was buried Abraham and Sarah his wife.*

⁽⁵⁾ And these *are* the generations of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, whom Hagar the Egyptian, Sarah's maid, bare to Abraham.

⁽¹⁾ And these *are* the names of the sons of Ishmael, by their names, according to their generations: the firstborn of Ishmael, Nebaioth, and Kedar, and Adbeel, and Mibsam, ⁽²⁾ and Mishma, and Dumah, and Massa, ⁽³⁾ Hadar, and Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kelema. ⁽⁴⁾ These *are* the sons of Ishmael, and these *are* their names, by their villages and by their kraals,—twelve princes after their folks.

⁽⁵⁾ And these *are* the years of the life of Ishmael, a hundred and thirty and seven years; and he expired and died, and was gathered to his people.*

⁽⁶⁾ And these *are* the generations of Isaac, the son of Abraham.

Abraham begat Isaac. ⁽⁷⁾ And Isaac was a son of forty years, at his taking Rebekah, the daughter of Bethuel the Syrian, out of Padan-Aram, the sister of Laban the Syrian, to himself for wife. ⁽⁸⁾ And Rebekah his wife conceived;* ⁽⁹⁾ and her days were fulfilled to bear, and behold, twins in her womb! ⁽¹⁰⁾ And the first came-out red (*admoni*, with play

on 'Edom'], all of him, as a mantle of hair, [sehar, with play on sehir, 'Seir,' and, perhaps, also on hesar, 'Esau,'] and they called his name Esau. ⁽²⁰⁾ And afterwards came-out his brother, and his hand grasping upon the heel (*hakeer*) of Esau; and (he) one called his name (*Yakov*) Jacob: and Isaac was a son of sixty years at her bearing them.*

26. ⁽²¹⁾ And Esau was a son of forty years, and he took as wife Judith, the daughter of Beeri the Hittite, and Basmath, the daughter of Elon the Hittite. ⁽²²⁾ And they were a bitterness of spirit to Isaac and to Rebekah.*

28. ⁽¹⁾ And Isaac called unto Jacob, and blessed him, and charged him, and said to him, 'Thou shalt not take a wife out of the daughters of Canaan. ⁽²⁾ Arise, go to Padan-Aram, to the house of Bethuel thy mother's father; and take to thee from thence a wife out of the daughters of Laban thy mother's brother. ⁽³⁾ And El-Shaddai bless thee, and fructify thee, and multiply thee, that thou be for a company of peoples, ⁽⁴⁾ and give thee the blessing of Abraham, to thee and to thy seed with thee, to thy inheriting the land of thy sojournings, which ELOHIM gave to Abraham!' ⁽⁵⁾ And Isaac put-forth Jacob, and he went to Padan-Aram, unto Laban, the son of Bethuel the Aramæan, the brother of Rebekah, the mother of Jacob and Esau.

⁽⁶⁾ And Esau saw that Isaac had blessed Jacob, and had sent-him-away to Padan-Aram, to take to him from thence a wife,—in blessing him too he charged him, saying, 'Thou shalt not take a wife out of the daughters of Canaan,'—⁽⁷⁾ and Jacob hearkened unto his father and unto his mother, and went to Padan-Aram. ⁽⁸⁾ And Esau saw that the daughters of Canaan were evil in the eyes of Isaac his father. ⁽⁹⁾ And Esau went unto Ishmael, and took Mahalath, the daughter of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, the sister of Nebaioth, (upon) over-and-above his wives, to him to wife.*

[There occurs here the first hiatus, as we suppose, in the Elohist document, the original statement of the marriage of Jacob (which was, probably, as brief as that of Isaac's marriage by the same writer in xxv.19) having been removed, to make way for the more circumstantial narrative of the Jehovist in xxix. Still, it would seem some fragments of the older story have been retained, as below, and that the births of all Jacob's sons, including Benjamin, were here given, and their names derived or played-upon by this writer, as in xvii.5,15, he has alluded to the meaning of Abraham and Sarah, in xvii.17,20 to those of Isaac ('Abraham laughed'), and Ishmael ('I have heard thee'), in xx.25,26 to those of Edom and Jacob, in xxxv.10,11,15, to those of Israel and Bethel. But these have been much overlaid by Jehovistic insertions. It is plain, that in v.20 the name Zebulun is twice derived, viz. from *zabad*, 'dower,' and *zabal*, 'dwell,' as Joseph is in v.23,24, (from *asaph*, 'gather' = 'take away,' and *yasaph*, 'add,') and that in v.14-16 a different explanation is implied of the name Issachar (from *sachar*, 'hire,') from what was intended by the writer of v.9,18. We may suppose that the Jehovist disapproved of some of the Elohist derivations, thinking them,

perhaps, far-fetched or indistinct; and he has consequently sometimes added his own, and sometimes substituted his own for that of the Elohist.]

29. ⁽²³⁾ And Laban gave to her Zilpah his maid to Leah his daughter as maid.* . . . ⁽²⁴⁾ And Laban gave to Rachel his daughter Bilhah his maid for maid.* . . . ^(25ab) And Leah conceived and bare a son, . . . and she called his name Reuben.* ^(25ad) And she conceived again and bare a son.* . . . and she called his name Simeon. ^(26a) And she conceived again and bare a son.* . . . ^(26ad) And she conceived again and bare a son.* . . . and she stood from bearing.

30. ^(1a) And Rachel saw that she bare not to Jacob,* ^(2a) and she gave to him Bilhah her maid for wife.* ⁽³⁾ And Bilhah conceived and bare to Jacob a son. ^(4a) And Rachel said, 'ELOHIM hath judged (*dan*) me.* . . . ⁽⁵⁾ And Bilhah, Rachel's maid, conceived again, and bare a second son to Jacob. ^(6ac) And Rachel said, 'With wrestlings (*naph-tulim*) of Elohîm have I wrestled with my sister,* and she called his name Naphtali.

⁽⁷⁾ And Leah saw that she had stood from bearing; and she took Zilpah her maid, and gave her to Jacob for wife. ⁽⁸⁾ And Zilpah, Leah's maid, bare to Jacob a son. ⁽⁹⁾ And Leah said, 'A troop (*gad*)!' and she called his name Gad. ⁽¹⁰⁾ And Zilpah, Leah's maid, bare a second son to Jacob. ⁽¹¹⁾ And Leah said, 'My blessing! for daughters will bless (*ashar*) me:' and she called his name Asher.*

⁽¹²⁾ And ELOHIM hearkened unto Leah, and she conceived, and bare to Jacob a fifth son. ⁽¹³⁾ And Leah said, 'ELOHIM hath given me my hire (*sachar*), because I have given my maid to my husband;' and she called his name Issachar. ⁽¹⁴⁾ And Leah conceived (yet) again, and bare a sixth son to Jacob. ⁽¹⁵⁾ And Leah said, 'ELOHIM hath presented (*zabad*) me with a good present,* and she called his name Zebulun. ⁽¹⁶⁾ And afterwards she bare a daughter, and she called her name Dinah.

⁽¹⁷⁾ And ELOHIM remembered Rachel, and ELOHIM hearkened unto her, and opened her womb. ⁽¹⁸⁾ And she conceived and bare a son, and she said, 'ELOHIM hath gathered (*asaph*) my reproach!' ⁽¹⁹⁾ And she called his name Joseph.*

31. ^(17a) And Jacob arose,* ⁽¹⁸⁾ and he led away all his cattle, and all his gain which he had gotten, the cattle of his property, which he had gotten in Padan-Aram, to go unto Isaac his father, to the land of Canaan.*

35. ⁽¹⁾ And ELOHIM appeared unto Jacob again [? unto Jacob, as before unto Abraham, xvii.1] at his coming from Padan-Aram, and spake with him: ⁽²⁾ And ELOHIM said to him, 'Thy name (is) Jacob: thy name shall not be called any longer Jacob, but Israel shall be thy name:' and He called his name Israel. ⁽³⁾ And ELOHIM said to him, 'I am EL-SHADDAI: fructify and multiply: a nation and a company of nations shall be out of thee; and kings shall go-forth out of thy loins. ⁽⁴⁾ And the land, which I gave to Abraham and to Isaac, to thee will I give it, and to thy seed after thee I will give the land.'

⁽⁵⁾ And ELOHIM went-up from him in the place where He spake with him. ⁽⁶⁾ And

Jacob erected a pillar in the place where Ho spake with him,—a pillar of stone; and he dropped upon it a drink-offering, and poured oil upon it. ⁽¹⁴⁾ And Jacob called the name of the place where ELOHIM spake with him, Beth-El.

^(15a) And they set-off from Beth-El, and it was still a space of land to come to Ephrath.* ⁽¹⁶⁾ And Rachel died, and was buried in the way of Ephrath.* ⁽²⁰⁾ And Jacob erected a pillar upon her grave.*

^(20b) And the sons of Jacob were twelve: ⁽²³⁾ the sons of Leah, Jacob's firstborn, Reuben, and Simeon, and Levi, and Judah, and Issachar, and Zebulun; ⁽²⁴⁾ the sons of Rachel, Joseph and Benjamin; ⁽²⁵⁾ and the sons of Bilhah, Rachel's handmaid, Dan and Naphtali; ⁽²⁶⁾ and the sons of Zilpah, Leah's handmaid, Gad and Asher. These *are* the sons of Jacob, which were born to him in Padan-Aram.

⁽²⁷⁾ And Jacob came unto Isaac his father, to Mamre, the city of Arba,* where Abraham sojourned, and Isaac. ⁽²⁸⁾ And the days of Isaac were an hundred and eighty years. ⁽²⁹⁾ And Isaac expired, and died, and was gathered unto his people, old and full of days; and Esau and Jacob, his sons, buried him.

36. ⁽¹⁾ And these are the generations of Esau—that is, Edom. ⁽²⁾ Esau took his wives out of the daughters of Canaan, Adah, daughter of Elon the Hittite, and Aholibamah, daughter of Anah, son of Zibeon the Hivite, ⁽³⁾ and Bashemath, daughter of Ishmael, sister of Nebaioth.

⁽⁴⁾ And Adah bare to Esau Eliphaz, and Bashemath bare Reuel, ⁽⁵⁾ and Aholibamah bare Jeush, and Jaalam, and Korah.

These are the sons of Esau, which were born to him in the land of Canaan.

⁽⁶⁾ And Esau took his wives, and his sons, and his daughters, and all the souls of his house, and his cattle and all his beasts, and all his gain which he had gotten in the land of Canaan, and went unto the land of Seir from the face of Jacob his brother. ⁽⁷⁾ For their gain was plentiful above living together, and the land of their sojourning was not able to bear them because of their cattle. ⁽⁸⁾ And Esau dwelt in Mount Seir: Esau, he is Edom.

⁽⁹⁾ And these are the generations of Esau, the father of Edom, in Mount Seir.

⁽¹⁰⁾ These *are* the names of the sons of Esau. Eliphaz, the son of Adah, Esau's wife: Reuel, the son of Bashemath, Esau's wife.

⁽¹¹⁾ And the sons of Eliphaz, — Teman, Omar, Zepho, and Gatam, and Kenaz. ⁽¹²⁾ And Timnah was concubine to Eliphaz, Esau's son; and she bare to Eliphaz Amalek.

These were the sons of Adah, Esau's wife.

⁽¹³⁾ And these the sons of Reuel—Nahath and Zerah, Shammah and Mizzah.

These were the sons of Bashemath, Esau's wife.

⁽¹⁴⁾ And these were the sons of Aholibamah, daughter of Anah, (daughter) granddaughter of Zibeon, Esau's wife.

And she bare to Esau Jeush, and Jaalam, and Korah.

⁽¹⁵⁾ These *were* dukes (? clans) of the sons of Esau.

The sons of Eliphaz, Esau's firstborn—duke

Teman, duke Omar, duke Zepho, duke Kenaz, ⁽¹⁶⁾ duke Korah, duke Gatam, duke Amalek.

These *were* the dukes of Eliphaz in the land of Edom; these were the sons of Adah.

⁽¹⁷⁾ And these the sons of Reuel, Esau's son—duke Nahath, duke Zerah, duke Shammah, duke Mizzah.

These *were* the dukes of Reuel in the land of Edom; these *were* the sons of Bashemath, Esau's wife.

⁽¹⁸⁾ And these *were* the sons of Aholibamah, Esau's wife—duke Jeush, duke Jaalam, duke Korah.

These *were* the dukes of Aholibamah, daughter of Anah, Esau's wife.

These *were* the sons of Esau, and these their dukes: he is Edom.*

⁽¹⁹⁾ And these *were* the kings who reigned in the land of Edom, before the reigning of a king over the children of Israel.

⁽²⁰⁾ And there reigned in Edom Bela the son of Beor, and the name of his city *was* Dinhabah.

⁽²¹⁾ And Bela died, and there reigned in his stead Jobab the son of Zerah, out of Bozrah.

⁽²²⁾ And Jobab died, and there reigned in his stead Husham, out of the land of the Temanite.

⁽²³⁾ And Husham died, and there reigned in his stead Hadad the son of Bedad,* and the name of his city *was* Avith.

⁽²⁴⁾ And Hadad died, and there reigned in his stead Samlah, out of Masrekah.

⁽²⁵⁾ And Samlah died, and there reigned in his stead Shaul, out of Rehoboth of the River (=Broadways on Euphrates).

⁽²⁶⁾ And Shaul died, and there reigned in his stead Baal-Hanan, son of Achbor.

⁽²⁷⁾ And Baal-Hanan, son of Achbor, died, and there reigned in his stead Hadar, and the name of his city *was* Pau, and his wife's name *was* Mehetabel, daughter of Matred, (daughter) granddaughter of Mezahab.

⁽²⁸⁾ And these are the names of the dukes (? clans) of Esau, according to their families, according to their places, by their names:—duke Timnah, duke Alvah, duke Jetheth, ⁽²⁹⁾ duke Aholibamah, duke Elah, duke Pinon, ⁽³⁰⁾ duke Kenaz, duke Teman, duke Mibzar, ⁽³¹⁾ duke Magdiel, duke Iram.

These *are* the dukes of Edom, according to their dwellings in the land of their possession: he is Esau, the father of Edom.

37. ⁽¹⁾ And Jacob dwelt in the land of his father's sojournings in the land of Canaan.

^(2a) These are the generations of Jacob.

Joseph, a son of seventeen years, was tending with his brethren among the flocks, and he was a lad with the sons of Bilhah and with the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives* . . .

^(2ab) And there passed-by Midianites, merchantmen* . . . ^(2b) And the Midianites sold him into Egypt, to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh, Captain of the Guard.* [It would seem that no part of the dramatic history of Joseph's being sold into Egypt, and of his adventures there, is from the hand of the Elohist. Indeed, it would be strange if he, who has given us so little out of Abraham's life, still less out of Jacob's, and scarcely anything out of Isaac's, should have expatiated at this length in the history of Joseph. But the

critical analysis shows that no part of this narrative belongs to him, except, perhaps, *vs.* 28^a, 36, which we assign to him, as above, though with some hesitation. As he knows nothing of any ill-blood between Sarah and Hagar, Ishmael and Isaac, Esau and Jacob, Leah and Rachel, so he probably knew of none between Joseph and his brothers, and may have represented Joseph here as merely kidnapped and carried off by the Midianites, while out one day, with only *four* of his brethren, tending his father's sheep. It is observable that these 'sons of Bilhah and sons of Zilpah' appear no more in the story. The Elohist may in a very few words have described the carrying-off of Joseph, *e.g.* 'and there passed-by Midianites, merchantmen, [and they saw Joseph and seized him], and the Midianites sold him into Egypt, &c.' The Elohist must then have stated how he came to be high in office under Pharaoh, and how Jacob and his sons became aware of his still being alive, and were induced to go down and settle in Egypt, all which has been removed, and replaced by the narrative which now stands in xxxvii, xxxix—xlv].

46. (*) And they took their cattle and their gain which they had gotten in the land of Canaan, and they came to Egypt, Jacob and all his seed with him. (†) His sons and his sons' sons with him, his daughters and his sons' daughters, and all his seed, brought he with him to Egypt.

(*) And these are the names of the sons of Israel that came to Egypt, Jacob and his sons: Jacob's firstborn, Reuben: (†) And the sons of Reuben, Enoch (E.V. Hanoch) and Pallu, Hezron and Carmi. (†^a) And the sons of Simeon, Jemuel, and Jamin, and Ohad, and Jachin, and Zohar, and Saul (E.V. Shaul) son of the Canaanitess. (†^b) And the sons of Levi, Gershon, and Kohath, and Merari. (†^c) And the sons of Judah, Er, and Onan, and Shelah, and Pharez, and Zarah. ★ (†^d) And the sons of Issachar, Tola, and Phuvah, and Job, and Shimron. (†^e) And the sons of Zebulun, Sered, and Elon, and Jahleel. (†^f) These are the sons of Leah, which she bare to Jacob in Padan-Aram, and Dinah his daughter—all the souls of his sons and his daughters, thirty-three. (†^g) And the sons of Gad, Ziphion, and Haggi, Shuni, and Ezbon, Eri, and Arodi, and Areli. (†^h) And the sons of Asher, Jimnah, and Ishuah, and Isui, and Beriah, and Serah their sister; and the sons of Beriah, Heber and Malchiel. (†ⁱ) These are the sons of Zilpah, whom Laban gave to Leah his daughter, and she bare these to Jacob, sixteen souls. (†^j) The sons of Rachel, Jacob's wife, Joseph and Benjamin. (†^k) And there were born to Joseph in the land of Egypt, which Asenath daughter of Potipherah priest of On, bare to him, Manasseh and Ephraim. (†^l) And the sons of Benjamin, Belah, and Becher, and Ashbel, Gera, and Naaman, Ehi and Rosh, Muppin, and Huppin, and Ard. (†^m) These are the sons of Rachel, which were born to Jacob—all the souls, fourteen. (†ⁿ) And the sons of Dan, Hushim. (†^o) And the sons of Naphtali, Jabzeel, and Guni, and Jezer, and Shilem. (†^p) These are the sons of Bilhah,

whom Laban gave to Rachel his daughter, and she bare these to Jacob—all the souls, seven.

(²⁶) All the souls of Jacob that came to Egypt, coming out of his loins, ★ all the souls were sixty-and-six. (²⁷) And the sons of Joseph, which were born to him in Egypt, were two souls. All the souls of the house of Jacob, that came to Egypt, were seventy.

47. (†) And Joseph brought Jacob his father, and stationed him before Pharaoh, and Jacob blessed Pharaoh. (†) And Pharaoh said unto Jacob, 'About what are the days of the years of thy life?' (†) And Jacob said unto Pharaoh, 'The days of the years of my sojournings are a hundred and thirty years; few and evil have been the days of the years of my life, and they have not come-up-with the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their sojournings.' (†^a) And Jacob blessed Pharaoh, and went forth from before Pharaoh.

(†^b) And Joseph settled his father and his brethren, and gave them a possession in the land of Egypt ★ in the land of Rameses, ★ (^{27b}) and they fructified and multiplied exceedingly. (²⁸) And Jacob lived in the land of Egypt seventeen years, and Jacob's days of the years of his life were a hundred and forty-seven years. ★

48. (†) And Jacob said unto Joseph, 'El Shaddai appeared unto me at Luz in the land of Canaan, and blessed me, (†) and said unto me, 'Behold! I will fructify thee and multiply thee, and (give) make thee for a company of peoples; and I will give this land to thy seed after thee, a perpetual possession.' (†) And now, thy two sons, which were born to thee in the land of Egypt (until) before my coming unto thee to Egypt, they are mine, Ephraim and Manasseh: even as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine. (†) And thy progeny, which thou hast begotten after them, shall be thine; by the names of their brothers shall they be called in their inheritance. (†) And I, at my coming from Padan—Rachel died beside me in the land of Canaan, when there was yet a space of land to come to Ephrath; and I buried her there in the way to Ephrath.' ★

49. (†^a) And Jacob called unto his sons, ★ (²⁹) and he charged them, and said unto them, 'I shall be gathered to my people: bury me unto my fathers, in the cave which is in the field of Ephron the Hittite, (^{29b}) in the cave which is in the field of Machpelah, which is east of Mamre, in the land of Canaan, which Abraham bought with the field from Ephron the Hittite, for a possession of a burying-place. (^{29c}) There they buried Abraham and Sarah his wife; there they buried Isaac and Rebekah his wife; and there I buried Leah. (^{29d}) The purchase of the field, and of the cave which is in it, was from the sons of Heth.' (^{29e}) And Jacob ended to charge his sons, and he gathered his feet into the bed, and he expired and was gathered unto his people. ★

(50. ¹²) And his sons carried him to the land of Canaan, and buried him in the cave of the field of Machpelah, which Abraham bought with the field for a possession of a burying-place from Ephron the Hittite, east of Mamre.



